DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 703 SP 032 307

TITLE	The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred First Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	25 Jul 89
NOTE	90p.; Serial No. 101-34.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; Elementary Secondary Education; Excellence in Education; *Federal Aid; *Financial Support; Hearings; Legislation; *Teacher Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 101st; *National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

ABSTRACT

Testimony was presented at this hearing about the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and current legislative proposals to provide federal assistance for its efforts. Suggestions, comments, and concerns were offered by representatives of the education profession, members of Congress, educational associations, and the Secretary of the Department of Education. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319703

SP

THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, JULY 25, 1989

Serial No. 101-34

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

21-273 ss WASHINGTON : 1989

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

SP 032 307

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

21-273 O - 89 - 1

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
GLENN POSHARD, Illinois
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia
JAIME B. FUSTER, Puerto Rico
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
JIM JONTZ, Indiana
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
PETER SMITH, Vermont

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

PAT WILLIAMS, Montana, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
GEORGE MILLER, California
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
GLENN POSHARD, Illinois
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
(Ex Officio)

E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, DC, on July 25, 1989	1
Statement of:	
Cavazos, Hon. Lauro, Secretary, U.S. Department of Education	4
Hunt, Hon. James B., Jr., former Governor of North Carolina and Chairman, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; and Dr. C. Peter Magrath, President, University of Missouri System, Columbia, Mo	19
Valentine, Hon. Tim, a Representatine in Congress from the State of North Carolina	42
Wise, Dr. Arthur, Director, Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession, Rand Corporation, representing the American Education Research Association; Dr. Max Larsen, President, Nebraska Board of Education, Lincoln, NB, representing the National Association of State Boards of Education; and Dr. Margaret A. Smith, Superintendent, Hempfield Area School District, Greensburg, PA, representing the American Association of School Administrators	54
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, prepared statement of	84
American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, prepared statement of	80
Cavazos, Hon. Lauro, Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, prepared statement of	8
Hunt, Hon. James B., Jr., former Governor of North Carolina and Chairman, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards:	
Letter dated October 13, 1989, enclosing additional material for the record	52
Prepared statement of	23
Larsen, Dr. Max, President, Nebraska Board of Education, prepared statement on behalf of the National Association of State Boards of Education	66
Magrath, Dr. C. Peter, President, University of Missouri System, Columbia, Missouri, prepared statement of	35
National Education Association, prepared statement of	72
Smith, Dr. Margaret A., Superintendent, Hempfield Area School District, Greensburg, Pennsylvania, prepared statement on behalf of the American Association of School Administrators	62
Wise, Dr. Arthur, Director, Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession, Rand Corporation, prepared statement on behalf of the American Education Research Association	57

THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

TUESDAY, JULY 25, 1989

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in Room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Pat Williams [Chairman] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Williams, Poshard, Coleman, Goodling, Henry, and Smith.

Staff present: Rick Jerue, Colleen Thompson, Michael Lance, Beth Buehlmann, and Jo-Marie St. Martin.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Good morning. I would like to call this hearing of the Postsecondary Education Subcommittee to order. I welcome each of you here today as we have this oversight hearing on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

During the last six years, a number of reports have focused our attention on the state of America's education system. In 1986, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy issued an impressive report entitled "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century."

That report provided education officials and policy makers with a number of recommendations to improve education quality for our students as well as their instructors. Included among those recommendations was a call for the creation of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Unlike many of the other recommendations that have been put forth in this area, the call for the creation of this board did not go unheeded. In the fall of 1987, with the help of the Carnegie Forum, the board was established. It is currently composed of 64 members representing a wide array of background and interests including education, government, business. More than half of the membership is made up of practicing educators.

I would like to commend the board for its fine work in assembling a very diverse and distinguished group of individuals who are structuring a framework for action and developing a consensus within the education and business communities about the need for professionalization within the teaching ranks.

The task they have undertaken is not an easy one. Education in the United States is essentially a local responsibility and it reflects the diversity of our land and our people. The establishment of any

national standard with regard to teaching can, in some cases, raise a red flag.

However, through its work, the board has shown the intelligence and sensitivity necessary to accomplish their goals without threatening the authority of local and state education agencies.

This morning we will be hearing testimony from our witnesses about the board, its work, and the current legislative proposals to provide Federal assistance for those efforts. We will be interested in hearing, of course, any suggestions, comments, or concerns that folks have about these proposals.

As a former teacher and education administrator, and a parent, and a very interested member of Congress, I am pleased to welcome each of you here today and look forward to your good counsel.

Mr. Coleman.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I, in lieu of an opening statement, have just a couple of observations to make. Your statement was one which I certainly want to associate myself with; especially to point out that the board and its makeup is wide-based.

I think they have assembled the key players in this profession to try to grapple what is obviously a very difficult issue, difficult in the sense that in the next eight years, it has been estimated that we will have one half of our current teaching force retire or leave the profession. Knowing this, how do we attract and retain the best of our people coming out of our institutions of higher education to go into this teaching profession.

There are some who will say today that this is not an issue which should be settled on the Federal level or a national level. To them I would suggest they think about why it shouldn't be, since it is a national problem. We have, in fact, a population which moves about quite freely in our society.

The crisis in education cannot be met by limiting it to state boundaries and the teaching profession itself is a national profession. Another concern that will be voiced today—and I frankly share this concern—is that the Federal Government getting involved directly with setting national standards.

I oppose any direct involvement by the Federal Government. I think that is one of the reasons why the board itself will set the standards, keeping that traditional state and local control of public education at the elementary and secondary level.

The teaching standards and the teaching profession, as I say, should be addressed as a national issue, not necessarily a Federal one and I would hope that the witnesses will explore this distinction today as well.

I think that we see this board as one that can identify and develop voluntary teaching standards for the teaching profession that will be high and rigorous. I, too, like you, Mr. Chairman, approach this not just with legislative blinders on, but as a parent as well and I look at this proposed board as a new departure in our thinking about teaching.

I think that if we are going to raise the teaching standards in this country, that somehow we have to do something different than what has been done in the past.

We will hear today from those that will testify in favor of the proposal. Through rigorous certification processes, we can raise the quality, the prestige, and, yes, the degree of teacher performance in the classroom. Doing this will help solve a number of problems, one of which is the very low pay that teachers command in this society.

If we can raise that in some fashion, by having a golden ring that they can grab for, to raise standards for greater salaries and to bring about changes in this profession, then I think it is for the good.

Now, obviously, all of us have concerns about spending. Twenty-five million dollars in a one trillion dollar budget is not significant, but $25 million is a great deal of money to this committee, considering the fact that we had to cut other programs recently under budget reconciliation instructions.

So, we have to be concerned about the money involved. We have to be concerned about other aspects in the funding of this proposal, but like you, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to those who testify in favor and those who might have a different opinion this morning because I think it is an extremely important subject, one which merits a hearing and one which I think will perhaps be a very important day in education in this country as we look at this problem.

Thank you very much.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you. Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. Are you sure you want to call on me?

Chairman WILLIAMS. Absolutely.

Mr. GOODLING. I don't want to mess up this love-in we are having here and I don't have any problems with the concept at all. But if we have $25 million and you give me that $25 million to get the best to join the teaching profession, I'll assure you that I am not going to do it by having some national teaching board.

Now, if we had a million teachers applying for a half million jobs, then a national teaching board it would a magnificent concept, but, folks, that isn't what we have. We are going to have just the opposite, as a matter of fact. We are going to be right back where we were after the World War II baby boom, and so, let's quit kidding ourselves.

We have to find some way to attract the brightest and best into the profession in the first place, and with limited dollars that we have on the Federal level, it seems to me this is not where we should be involved.

Again, I have no problem with the concept. I think the concept is fine and it is great for those who are out there in the teaching profession, but let me tell you, those areas that have the most money to spend at the present time attract all the brightest and best.

They steal them from everybody else. I went through this for many, many years. If you are not from an affluent school district, even if you have an equalization formula in your state, you're still going to have the problem of trying to keep the best because you don't have the money to pay them.

The first thing we have to do is attract the brightest and best to the profession. This reminds me a little of my dad when I was making $2,300 a year teaching and he kept saying, "I don't know why you are living at home; you aren't saving money."

Well, I was coaching three sports for nothing and I had to pay for the shoes and the food that the kids ate in order to have them out there in a competitive mode and his next response then would be, "But you have a magnificent retirement program."

Here I am, twenty-one years old, and he is telling me about that magnificent retirement program, so, folks, I think we had better put our priorities in order when we talk about $25 million. That is a lot of money, if I could offer it, I would give loans to the brightest and best who will go into the teaching profession, not in York Suburban School District in my district, but in Center City in Chicago or in the hills of Kentucky or some place of that nature, but I don't see that we have the money now to be involved.

The concept is fine. The private effort has been great. In my estimation, that is where it should remain.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you. We are pleased today with the presence of the Secretary of Education, Secretary Cavazos. We are delighted that you are with us, Mr. Secretary. We look forward to hearing your testimony and receiving your good counsel on this important matter.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LAURO CAVAZOS, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to submit my comments for the record.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Without objection, it will be included in the record.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you, sir. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to be here today to discuss the proposed legislation regarding the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

With me is Bruno Manno, the Department's Acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Let me begin by saying that we would like to see the national board accomplish its mission. Its goals are consistent with what we believe is needed to improve American education.

If the standards are high and the prerequisites do not deny certification to those who enter the profession through alternate routes, a national system of voluntary professional certification could in time stimulate important improvements in American education.

It could raise the standards of performance of the profession as a whole and thus provide a better education for children. It could help to stimulate changes and improvements in the preparation of teachers. It could lead to higher salaries for excellent teachers and thus provide an incentive for teachers to strive for excellence in their teaching and encourage more and better qualified individuals to enter the profession. It could inspire more talented individuals to pursue teaching as a profession and as a career. The establishment of national standards for teachers is a laudable attempt to improve teaching in schools across the United States.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to mention another effort that would similarly strengthen America's teaching force, an effort that in my view must be included in any discussion of how to boost teaching as

a profession: President Bush's Alternative Teacher and Principal Certification Program.

Proposed as part of the Educational Excellence Act of 1989, this initiative would award a total of $25 million to states for the purpose of creating or expanding programs designed to draw into schools talented individuals who may lack conventional teacher training, but who may nevertheless be well qualified to teach.

Evidence from New Jersey and elsewhere, including a recent study of 64 non-traditional programs for recruiting, retraining and certifying teachers makes it clear that such a program could be instrumental in attracting more well-educated individuals and more minorities into schools, particularly those to teach subjects such as science and mathematics where there is an absolutely critical need.

Mr. Chairman, this initiative would help communities devise ways to tap local talent and, therefore, improve their schools. It would help schools and communities to measurably improve student learning and performance in a non-academic area. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards could have a similar effect on schools and students.

That brings me to the issue before the subcommittee, the national board's request for Federal support. The national board is a private organization governed by rules of its own making, addressing priorities established entirely on its own. The board currently operates with total independence of the Federal Government and that in my judgment is the way it ought to remain.

The fact that we applaud the board's current objectives does not mean that we can also support a grant of public funds to help it do its work. Mr. Chairman, we in the Department have serious doubts about the wisdom of granting Federal funds to support the work of the board.

We have three major concerns. One, the Department as a rule opposes sole-source contracts, particularly when the recipient of Federal dollars does not have an established track record and the money is to be used for unspecified research and development activities. Two, the proposal under consideration lacks accountability to the Secretary of Education. Three, the funds requested by the board are excessive and the research would likely duplicate some research activities that are currently underway or planned by the Department.

Let me elaborate further. Consistent with laws and regulations, the Department's policy and practice with respect to grants and contracts is to award Federal funds through open competitive procedures based on merit.

These procedures include an opportunity for all qualified organizations to seek funding. Their proposals are reviewed by the Department and by a panel of peer reviewers based on published evaluation criteria.

While it is true that Federal contracts in the past have been given without competition, this has occurred only when there was proof beyond a reasonable doubt that a particular contractor was uniquely qualified to carry out the work required.

Here we are faced with a new organization having no proven ability to accomplish the task for which it is requesting Federal funds. Mr. Chairman, to sidestep traditional competitive proce-

dures would hardly reflect the kind of fiscal prudence that taxpayers of this country expect of us.

On the second point, the award to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards once made would allow for little accountability to the Secretary who is accountable to taxpayers for the way the appropriation is spent.

While other forms of accountability are authorized, funds proposed for the board would not be subject to the administrative oversight commonly required in Federal grants and contracts.

In fact, once the check was issued, the Department of Education would have no authority whatsoever to control the manner in which the grant funds were used. The Department would have no way of knowing what activities would be supported with Federal funds, no way to determine whether these activities are a good use of Federal resources, and no way to ascertain if a return on the investment can be expected.

Further, no substantial and reliable evidence has been provided to justify the level of funds being requested, a level that exceeds the budget of the Department's entire Office of Research, which supports 20 research and development centers around the country.

Without very detailed and concrete evidence, it is incredible to think that we could ever consider such a funding level for a single purpose entity. This is an example of how a lack of competition and fair procedures can result in a board naming its price, so to speak, in essence without careful estimate by the government of what the work will actually cost.

Regarding the content of research proposed by the board, let me point out that through its national research centers, the Department now supports substantial research which will provide information on teacher assessment and certification procedures for elementary and secondary school teachers.

The National Center for Research on Teacher Education at Michigan State is currently engaged in an effort to identify what teachers need to know and do to teach effectively in specific content areas.

Other centers have undertaken similar or related efforts, including the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, also at Michigan State, and the various research centers in content area, the centers for the study of teaching and learning in mathematics, science, reading, writing and other subjects.

In fiscal year 1990, we plan to launch several other teacher related efforts including a competition that would award grants to identify ways to improve and assess teacher performance. Mr. Chairman, these are a few of the more relevant research and development activities either underway already or planned by the Department.

To establish the board at the funding level suggested, without the Department's oversight and monitoring, could open a Pandora's box of duplication, inefficiency and wastefulness in the Federal education research system.

This would be particularly harmful today, at a time when efforts are under way to do just the opposite, to improve communication and collaboration among Federal research components and to coordinate these activities as a unified, coherent system.

In closing, let me reiterate that we wish the board well as it proceeds with its new venture, but, Mr. Chairman, we in the Department believe that it would be highly inappropriate to support this effort in the manner proposed.

Thank you. We will be pleased to answer any questions you might have, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Lauro F. Cavazos follows:]

Statement of

Lauro F. Cavazos, Secretary of Education

Before the

Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education

House Committee on Education and Labor

July 25, 1989

Secretary Cavazos is accompanied by

Bruno Manno

Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Educational

Research and Improvement

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I'm pleased to be here today to discuss the proposed legislation regarding the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. With me is Bruno Manno, the Department's Acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Let me begin by saying that we would like to see the National Board accomplish its mission. Its goals are consistent with what we believe is needed to improve American education.

If the standards are high and the prerequisites do not deny certification to those who enter the profession through alternate routes, a national system of voluntary professional certification could in time stimulate important improvements in American education:

- It could raise the standards of performance of the profession as a whole and thus provide a better education for children.
- It could help to stimulate changes and improvements in the preparation of teachers.
- It could lead to higher salaries for excellent teachers and thus provide an incentive for more teachers to strive for excellence in their teaching and encourage more and better qualified individuals to enter the profession.
- It could inspire more talented individuals to pursue teaching as a profession and as a career.

Alternative Certification

The establishment of national standards for teachers is a laudable attempt to improve teaching in schools across the United States.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to mention another effort that would similarly strengthen America's teaching force, an effort that in my view must be included in any discussion of how to boost teaching as a profession: President Bush's Alternative Teacher and Principal Certification program. Proposed as part of the Educational Excellence Act of 1989, this initiative would award a total of $25 million to states for the purpose of creating or expanding programs designed to draw into schools talented individuals who may lack conventional teacher training but who may nevertheless be well qualified to teach. Evidence from New Jersey and elsewhere--including a recent study of 64 non-traditional programs for recruiting, retraining, and certifying teachers--makes

it clear that such a program could be instrumental in attracting more well-educated individuals and more minorities into schools, particularly to teach subjects such as science and mathematics, where there is a critical need.

Mr. Chairman, this initiative would help communities devise ways to tap local talent and thereby improve their schools. It would help schools and communities to measurably improve student learning and performance in non-academic areas. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards could have a similar effect on schools and students. That brings me to the issue before the Subcommittee: the National Board's request for Federal support.

The National Board is a private organization, governed by rules of its own making, addressing priorities established entirely on its own. The Board currently operates with total independence from the Federal government. And that, in my judgment, is the way it ought to remain.

The fact that we applaud the Board's current objectives does not mean that we can also support a grant of public funds to help it do its work. Mr. Chairman, we in the Department have serious doubts about the wisdom of granting Federal funds to support the work of the Board. We have three major concerns:

1) The Department, as a rule, opposes sole source contracts, particularly when the recipient of Federal dollars does not have an established track record and the money is to be used for unspecified research and development activities.

2) The proposal under consideration lacks accountability to the Secretary of Education.

3) The funds requested by the Board are excessive and the research would likely duplicate some research activities that are currently underway or are planned by the Department.

Let me elaborate further. Consistent with laws and regulations, the Department's policy and practice with respect to grant and contracts, is to award Federal funds through open, competitive procedures based on merit. These procedures include an opportunity for all qualified organizations to seek funding. Their proposals are reviewed by the Department and by a panel of peer reviewers based on published evaluation criteria. While it is true that Federal contracts in the past have been given without competition, this has occurred only when there was proof beyond a reasonable doubt that a particular contractor was uniquely qualified to carry out the work required.

Here we are faced with a new organization having no proven ability to accomplish the task for which it is requesting Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, to sidestep traditional competitive procedures would hardly reflect the kind of fiscal prudence that taxpayers of this country expect of us.

On the second point, the award to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, once made, would allow for little accountability to the Secretary, who is accountable to the taxpayers for the way the appropriation is spent. While other forms of accountability are authorized, funds proposed for the Board would not be subject to the administrative oversight commonly required in Federal grants and contracts. In fact, once a check was issued, the Department of Education would have no authority whatsoever to control the manner in which the grant funds were used. The Department would have no way of knowing what activities would be supported with Federal funds, no way to determine that they are a good use of Federal resources, and no way to ascertain if a return on the investment can be expected.

Further, no substantial and reliable evidence has been provided to justify the level of funds being requested, a level that exceeds the budget of the Department's entire Office of Research, which supports twenty research and development centers around the country. Without very detailed and concrete evidence, it is incredible to think that we could even consider such a funding level for a single purpose entity. This is an example of how a lack of competition and fair procedures has resulted in the Board naming its price, in essence without a careful estimate by the government of what the work will actually cost.

Regarding the content of the research proposed by the Board, through its national research centers the Department now supports substantial research which will provide information on "teacher assessment and certification procedures for elementary and secondary school teachers." The National Center for Research on Teacher Education, for instance, (at Michigan State University) is currently engaged in an effort to identify what teachers need to know and do to teach effectively in specific content areas. Other centers have undertaken similar or related efforts, including the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects (also at Michigan State) and the various research centers in content areas--the centers for the study of teaching and learning in mathematics, science, reading, writing, and other subjects.

In fiscal year 1990, we plan to launch several other teacher-related research efforts, including a competition that would award grants to identify ways to improve and assess teaching performance. Mr. Chairman, these are a few of the many relevant research and development activities either already under way or planned at the Department. To establish the Board at the funding level suggested, without the Department's oversight and monitoring could open a

Pandora's box of duplication, inefficiency, and wastefulness in the Federal education research system. This would be particularly harmful today, at a time when efforts are under way to do just the opposite, to improve communication and collaboration among Federal research components and to coordinate these activities as a unified, coherent system.

In closing, let me reiterate that we wish the Board well as it proceeds with its new venture. But Mr. Chairman, we in the Department believe that it would be highly inappropriate to support this effort in the manner proposed.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Mr. Coleman, any questions of the Secretary?

Mr. COLEMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr. Secretary, thank you for your comments. I want to say first of all that I am glad that you had some positive things to say about this at the beginning and I understand.

I want to go over some of your concerns about it. Has the Department worked with the board on these national standards? I know they must have sought your support and I wonder if you are unalterably opposed to the board and to its makeup and to what it is trying to do and perhaps, is there any way we might be able to get more support from the Department if certain things were to be done through drafting legislation?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Let me start out, Mr. Coleman, by saying, I really do believe that this is an important approach that they are taking, that is to establish a board for certification.

Anything that you can do to raise the standards of teaching certainly has our support. I pointed out in my testimony that we feel that this is one mechanism for professionalizing the profession of teaching itself.

I have stated often that we must find ways to reward teachers. As you know, of course, one of the President's initiatives in his legislative request is the merit component for teachers. We are constantly seeking ways to identify good teachers and reward good teaching.

I think where we really have our major problem, though, is in the whole area of funding a separate entity. Now, I know that there have been a few exceptions in the past of funding by the Federal Government of agencies that have not been selected through the competitive process, but those have been very, very rare.

I think there was one on family practice back in the 1970s, but all of the other certification procedures, whether for physicians or attorneys, really stand aside and are separate from the Federal Government. That is the way it should be.

Now, as to whether we are unalterably opposed to funding the board, what I am saying is that we are unalterably opposed to sole-source funding going directly to the board. Now, if they wanted to compete through the normal procedure, and submit to peer review, that is fine; we would have no trouble with that.

That is the normal mechanism. However, I still believe that $25 million is excessive.

Mr. COLEMAN. Assuming that the board receives sole-source funding, but in turn they would provide for competitive grants; submit to review by you as Secretary and oversight by the Congress; audits by the General Accounting Office; and provide annual reports to both you and to Congress. Would any or all of these elements assist in bringing about support by the Department?

Secretary CAVAZOS. I really believe that all those conditions, that you point out are important regardless of whether they were to receive a sole-source or competitive award everybody needs to be accountable.

We believe that a separate group, working independently, would tend to duplicate a lot of the research that we are already doing. I really believe that it should be the other way around.

21-273 O - 89 - 2

We are interested in having people compete, and if only one group applies for an award, that is fine. But I still must repeat that a sole-source grant, even with all of the requirements that you have tied on it would still present the fundamental, basic problem. There would be lack of control and lack of accountability. You asked one other question about whether we have been working with the group, and I would like Bruno Manno, the Acting Assistant Secretary, to comment on that, please.

Mr. MANNO. There have been some general discussions with representatives of the board, similar to the kinds of discussions we would have with any group that is interested in pursuing an award with the Department.

These are general discussions about procurement methods and accountability and other sorts of monitoring that would occur once a grant is awarded by the Department.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Secretary, finally, let me just say that I don't want to denigrate anybody else's efforts and I am sure the studies that have been going on are going to be good studies, but if you look at the makeup of this board, it is uniquely qualified body, with a wide constituency.

Here you have the presidents of two major teacher unions, the AFT and the NEA. You have bipartisan gubernatorial support. You have the school boards and I believe the principals—I am not sure about that, but the national, I think, School Board Association is supporting it.

You have some very top teachers, some of whom I know personally and know of their intense involvement in trying to raise the standards of their professions and while I certainly agree that competition is good, I dare say if there was a competition, an award for this that there would be very few bodies that I know of that could come close to competing with the stature of these folks, so when they come forth, I am going to ask them the same questions.

I don't think they would shirk away from being competitive. I also look at this as some being, and on the private sector, some major corporate support on that board. These people want to do something for this country and I don't want to turn them off.

Maybe we don't want to turn them on with $25 million, but we don't want to turn them off either and that is something else that we all want to consider as we proceed on these things, so I am suggesting some tightening up, some auditing and some oversight and some accountability which you and I both believe are very important; all of us do.

I hope that we kind of keep the final resolution of this a little bit off and say never and I am glad that your remarks today have not done that. They have been constructive and I appreciate that and I think any other suggestions you can make to make this thing much better will make it that much better.

I thank you for coming here.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you, Mr. Coleman.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Poshard?

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, forgive me for being late. I am sorry that I missed part of the Secretary's statement. Just an obvious question. Mr. Secretary, why do we need professional teaching standards set at the Federal level?

Secretary CAVAZOS. We should not set standards at the Federal level. I really believe that is a state responsibility, a local responsibility.

We can give guidelines or ideas. Just as for example, we cannot prescribe nor should we prescribe a curriculum. However, we certainly have prepared model curricula that we think should be emphasized.

I want to emphasize another point because this board, the people that have worked on this, are outstanding people, personal friends of mine, people whom I have known for many years and have great respect for. I think their effort is laudable.

Anything that we can do to elevate and give support to the teaching profession is important, but I think the board should step away from the Federal Government. It is a private entity, not unlike the AMA or the Bar Association or other such national groups.

We don't really prescribe from the Federal Government how those professions should be controlled beyond certain general guidelines, and so, therefore, my answer is we should not prescribe teaching standards from the Federal level.

Mr. POSHARD. I think I have always been pretty much in agreement with you on that approach. I have watched so many programs, even from the state level, come down to the local school systems, model teaching programs, standards.

Usually they gather dust on a shelf because the art of teaching, I think, is very complex. It seems to me that these are things that are best left up to our professional schools of education, the universities. That is where I think the failure is coming from.

Just not getting the people out in the schools, getting them to see the different kinds of teaching styles and learning styles that are out there in the appropriate mix, I am not sure we can dictate to anybody what ought to be the perfect teaching standard or the perfect teaching style at any level for any curriculum.

Teaching is very complex. This concerns me quite a bit, Mr. Chairman, to be frank with you, in terms of establishing now a national board which is going to make it clear how we should be teaching children in our schools.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. Just one question, Mr. Secretary. I think you are currently making decisions with regard to the recompetition of the national labs and centers. Have you thought of focusing one of those centers, or one of those labs on the whole idea of evaluating teachers?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Mr. Goodling, certainly I think we are open yet to ideas on shaping those competitions. We are still engaging in good, open discussions. I would like to ask Mr. Manno, perhaps, to comment because he is more familiar with the detail of that.

Mr. MANNO. Yes, in fact, we have, sir. We have, over the last two months, been engaging in wide consultation with a variety of groups, associations, education associations, as well as other kinds of groups, soliciting input on that center competition.

I would have to say that during the course of those discussions, this suggestion has come up a number of times from a variety of groups. This is actively being considered as a possible topic area for

investigation when we recompete the centers over the course of the next year or so.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you. I have no other questions.

Chairman WILLIAMS. We are pleased that Mr. Smith, who although not a formal member of this subcommittee, has joined us because of his interest. Mr. Smith, do you have questions of the Secretary.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I confessed to you having an interest and should on the record tell my colleagues on this Committee that I have been involved with this project prior to my ascension to the United States Congress. We all wear our conflicts on our sleeves.

I need to clarify something, Mr. Secretary, because first of all I do have a question. In Mr. Poshard's questioning of you, I was left with an impression that is not the impression I had when I walked in, which is that my understanding is that this board as it is conceived of by the people who have put it together, when it completes its research and establishes itself, will be free-standing, voluntary, non-governmental, professionally-based and away from all forms of government and, in fact, I could be a teacher for 50 years in the classroom and never seek the certification that this board offers and not have my career changed in the negative in any regard.

Secretary CAVAZOS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Between the interplay there, I wasn't sure that that was—okay. I wanted to just simply ask you about the sole-source, the issue—I missed your testimony, but I glanced through it and the issue of the Pandora's box of duplication and inefficiency, without seeming to be unfair, could you sort of relate to me how it is that the research which the Department of Education is involved with finds its way to the classroom and how satisfied you are historically with the connection between the labs and actual learning changes for children because my humble opinion, the connection has been faulty at best over the last 20 years.

Secretary CAVAZOS. I agree with your final point that the connection has been faulty at best, but I think it is going to take a long time to change some of the problems that we are facing in terms of techniques and evaluations and the teaching profession itself.

We will select those areas in which we are seeking to do research and publish notification of that. There will be competition for the grants, with funding decisions based on peer review. We continue to insist that everybody follow those peer review procedures, and after the grants are made, they are monitored.

The next step would be publication of the information from the research efforts. From there, we hope to see the state level or the local level trying to get across those changes. Much of the research is used by the schools of education as they try to give direction and improve teaching.

We are working not only from the research side, but also with groups in either informal or formal ways to change the teaching profession and teacher education.

The states are doing an awful lot and we are getting input there. So, Mr. Smith, when we go through it all, I think you have a variety of strategies, not just the research. That is one piece of it, but

many, many other things are coming together to shape ultimately the decision about improving education.

Mr. SMITH. I guess simply my observation would be that without any quarreling with your language here, that to say that an organization that has a research agenda and, in fact, has something which candidly the labs have never had, and some of the research has been excellent, but what they have is a proposed market and context for using the research which they do.

In other words, they aren't simply doing the research in order to find out and then put it out to the world and say what do you think. They are doing the research because they have a use plan for the consequences of that research, the results of that research, and I don't think it a fair characterization to say that that is going to open a Pandora's box of duplication.

I would suggest they have a real goal orientation for their research, whereas, there is a much broader, more diverse orientation that the labs have and the Department has, and while I can understand that someone might think $25 million is too much or that the board is a bad idea—those are two positions that I happen not to hold—I would like to think that just because these folks have a goal, have an agenda, have invested an enormous amount of their own time and money and effort, and credibility and goodwill and because they are here with that agenda asking for help, that is no reason to dismiss them out of hand.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Mr. Smith, I agree with that. I pointed out earlier in my testimony that I think the board's goal is a laudable goal.

I just have a basic problem with a sole-source grant. I have a problem with duplication of effort. We all have the same goal and I applaud it. I really followed the development of this board over the last couple of years and I think it is great. Anything that we can do to improve it, I am going to support.

However, to set aside $25 million to go directly to the board, that is where I have a problem. Now, I have absolutely no problem with their coming in and being competitive and going after that funding. I want to make one other point here that is the recognition that the $25 million, as I understood, is to be matched by an additional $25 million from the private sector. I think that is one of the most important things that can happen.

I have talked often about the importance of the private sector becoming involved in the educational process. I think that the matching is a good move and I applaud it. I just have trouble with the funding mechanism, the sole-source award.

Mr. SMITH. Okay. I appreciate that. I think that if we are serious about professionalizing the profession of teaching, that this board has the opportunity to change the context within which teachers operate and to do so in a way that precisely because it is outside the system of government and doing it in a way that hasn't been done before and doing it very well.

Anyway, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you. Mr. Secretary, I want to assure you that your presence on this issue is not lost on this Committee. I know this is a matter of significant importance to the Department, to the administration.

If it wasn't, you would not have come personally to this Committee. We appreciate your coming and understand why you are here. I think your objections are well taken. They center on, as I understand it, three points.

You oppose sole-source funding. You believe that the proposal as we understand it lacks accountability to your office and to you and finally, you think that the funds requested are excessive.

There may be some room, as a couple of members on the Republican side have indicated, there may be some room here for some type of a coming together. I am struck by the fact that this proposal would seem to meet the education funding philosophy as expressed by the last two administrations.

There have been those within both Reagan and the Bush Administrations and many in the Congress who believe that the appropriate role of the Federal Government in education should be primarily related to data collection, education research, analysis, review oversight.

It also has been expressed many times by both administrations, particularly the Reagan Administration, and former President Reagan's Secretaries of Education, that the private sector as well as the local and state education agencies should be equal partners in establishment of education priorities and systems and that the Federal Government should just simply play at aiding a helpful role in that.

Now, I have not seen a proposal in the little past a decade that I have been in Congress that more clearly fits those priorities than does this one. It is asking for Federal assistance only in data collection for the purposes of assessment and, by the way, this is not a certification board, it is an assessment board.

I know we use the word "certification." This board does not certify, it simply develops techniques for assessment. Certainly, it is a combination of private and local resources including the genius of America's private enterprise system that have come together to try to do the work of this board.

Now, in the tradition of the last two administrations, they are coming to Congress saying, "We don't want you to be involved in this, but we would like you to help fund some of the research, and preparation."

If we could find a way to establish that accountability that you speak of, and if we did determine that $25 million was, in fact, excessive, do you think that there is room there to work with the administration on an eventual authorization and appropriation for this board?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Mr. Chairman, I really, first of all, will work with any group to explore all possibilities because I think for us to enter into these discussions with a closed mind is not going to be productive.

So, I will continue to talk and to seek counsel and give direction. However, if the authorization ends up structured as it is proposed here, I don't see how I could support it.

I am going to come back to another point. It is fine that you have this separate group. I deeply appreciate the job that they are going to do; I hope they are going to be successful. But when it comes to

supporting research. one of the major missions in the Department of Education, you already have the Federal agency to do that.

It is already functioning. The research, I really believe, has been starting to pay off. It is an important aspect of the role that we must play. Giving good leadership is key in these directions, so we will work with any group that wants to come in and be a part of that system.

Chairman WILLIAMS. I appreciate that, Mr. Secretary. Again, we want to thank you for your kindness in being with us today. Thank you very much.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Our second panel of Governor Hunt, Dr. Magrath will please come forward.

Mr. Shanker and Ms. Futrell are unable to be with us, however, both of their organizations, The American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association have been active members of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. They have both submitted testimony and without objection, their testimony will be included in the record.

Governor, it is nice to see you here today. Please proceed.

STATEMENTS OF THE HONORABLE JAMES B. HUNT, JR., FORMER GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA AND CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS; AND DR. C. PETER MAGRATH, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SYSTEM, COLUMBIA, MO.

Mr. HUNT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and members of this Committee. I want to thank you on behalf of two and a half million teachers in this country for holding this hearing and for allowing us to share with you the promise of the work of this National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

It is a promise to dramatically improve the education of American students. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership of this vital committee, yours, Congressman Coleman, and all of you who are here and particularly for your opening statements.

In addition to my written statement which I wish to have submitted for the record, you have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that you do have the statements of Mary Futrell, president of the NEA, and Al Shanker, president of the AFT.

I would also like to submit for the record the testimony of Mr. David Kearns, Chairman of the board of Xerox, who is author of the book, "The Brain Race," and also a member of this board.

Mr. Chairman, once in a long time and I dare say, you haven't seen this happen very often, a simple, but powerful idea comes along that has a catalytic effect in making other things happen. That is what the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is.

It was the first recommendation of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching report in 1986. Within months of that report coming forward, it was unanimously endorsed, including this board, its creation and its work by the National Governors Associations, all 50 governors in this country.

The purpose of this board, and let me reiterate, Mr. Chairman and members of this Committee, that this is a private, voluntary, non-governmental, professional board, the purpose of it, in the words of Governor Tom Kean of New Jersey, who is a founding member of this board and who testified before the Senate Committee last year, the purpose is to set high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do and to board certified teachers who meet those high standards.

Notice, it is what they know and are able to do, being able to teach high standards, not the lower standards that are required to license or to have state certification. That is what we frequently speak of, state certification. That is the legal certification.

We are talking about something that would be private, that would go way beyond that and set the kind of high standards that I believe we really want to see in America's classrooms. It is aimed at raising teaching standards throughout the classrooms of America, and frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is aimed at boldly moving our nation toward educational excellence, toward the kind of world class schools, taught by world class teachers that we know we have got to have in this country if we are going to be competitive again, if we are going to lead the world again in a way that you all address yourselves to so often in this Congress.

The board was established in May of 1987. As you have animated here already, it is composed of 63 top teachers and leaders of this country. So many people have commented on the fact that the two great teacher organizations of this country, the NEA and the AFT are strongly supported; their presidents sit on this board.

As a matter of fact, they came together along with school boards and all of these others in helping to form this and commit the nation to higher standards. I think that is historically important and something that ought to be supportive.

We have on it also the president of the National School Board's Association, past and present, and present presidents. We have top school administrators, principals, superintendents and state school board chiefs. We have the head of the Xerox Company and the DuPont Company.

Most importantly, however, we have dozens of just top teachers, the finest professional teachers you can imagine, the kind that you want to see in our classrooms, including the president of the National Academy of Science Teachers and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and there are disciplined organizations working with us to help set these high standards.

We want to report to you today, Mr. Chairman, and members of this Committee, not an idea that we want to do down the road, you know, something that we have in mind. We come today to report to you that this board has been hard at work now for two years, working with great unity.

Almost every decision we have made has been unanimous, and last week, we announced the five principle standard areas in which we will assess teachers beginning in 1993, we announced the perquisites for those teachers who choose to sit for board certification; we announced the 29 to 30 fields in which certificates will be given; the significant progress we have made toward developing an array of assessments that are free of bias; and we announced our efforts

to push forward school reform, better teacher preparation in our colleges and universities, and efforts to attract more young people, especially minority youngsters into teaching.

I hope I will have a chance to discuss that a little more later because I think this is the best way to get the best in the classroom. We have an awesome task, just an awesome task ahead of us to set the specific standards and assessments to certify teachers in every subject matter in this country and at the elementary, the middle, and the high school levels.

The doctors did it, Mr. Chairman, over several decades in America because we can't wait for better teachers and for better schools in this country; we have got to do it in the next five years, so you can see what a huge task it is.

The cost of doing the research and development will be about $50 million. The private sector—and I want to stress this to everybody; it has been mentioned before—the private sector is committed to raise one half of it and that is more than has been raised for any educational enterprise in this country privately in our history, but they cannot raise more than $25 million.

Leaders such as Dick Heckert, chairman of DuPont; David Kearns of Xerox, Lee Iacocca at Chrysler, all whose companies have given a half million dollars and they are out there raising funds right now. Dick Heckert is contacting 37 companies this week, many of them on the telephone personally.

These private leaders say that they consider it imperative and I wish they were here to talk to you, but David Kearns' testimony is here for you, imperative that our national government provide a one-time appropriation of $25 million that the private sector will match.

Again, we have never had this kind of matching go on before for this kind of purpose. As we have said to the Senate subcommittee and the Full Labor and Human Resources Committee which has recommended these funds just last week, it is entirely appropriate that the Congress provide funds strictly for research and development, just as you did over ten years ago for the development of the Emergency Medical Board.

Perhaps some of you are not aware that that was done, but $750 thousand came to the Congress for that purpose and that is just one board out of about 32 that they have. It is essential that there be full accountability for the use of these funds and we worked with the Democrats and the Republican Senators most of last year to develop detailed provisions to assure accountability, peer review and competition for the use of the funds by the dozens of United States universities and centers that we expect to have helping us in this work.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, this volunteer, professional board must be independent as well as accountable. There must not be a Federalization of teaching standards and teacher assessments in this country.

It mustn't be a governmental thing anymore than there should be a Federalized curriculum which I think all of us oppose, but we will work with this Committee and in the spirit of some of the questions that came from many of you, we will work with this Committee.

We have been working with the Secretary of the Department of Education. We are pledged to continue to do that, to guarantee accountability even beyond that provided by projects that are fully administered by the Department of Education.

With Japan leading us in so many ways and the European community closing in fast, I believe the need to take bold, unprecedented steps to reasset our economic leadership of the world is essential.

The Congress can do that with two pieces of legislation that history will record—child care and support for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

I urge you to introduce a bill to do that, Mr. Chairman and to find a way to join your colleagues in the Senate in passing it this year.

Thank you very much for this opportunity and I will be delighted to try to respond to questions.

[The prepared statement of Hon. James B. Hunt follows:]

Testimony for the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education

Submitted by

James B. Hunt, Jr.
Chair
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

July 25, 1989

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. It is an honor to be with you and to testify on behalf of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards which I have the privilege of chairing. Although I come here to encourage your support of the important work of the National Board, my interest in education reform and renewal is long-standing.

As Governor of North Carolina and Chairman of the Education Commission of the States, I supported the cause of educational improvement with all the energy I could muster. It is a cause I continue to support for the stakes today are higher than at any time in our history. Put bluntly, we cannot compete in international markets without world class schools, and world class schools demand world class teachers.

As Governor, I was acutely aware of the importance of education to North Carolina's long term well being; and as I survey the needs of the nation I am acutely aware of the importance of high levels of educational achievement to the nation's well being. North Carolina's competition is no longer just California, Texas, Massachusetts or South Carolina, it is Singapore, Sweden, Germany and Japan. All of our states have a growing awareness of the challenge posed by a united Europe and the countries of the Pacific Rim that are anything but complacent about the quality of their education systems.

Look, for example, at the competition: Japan, reduced to ashes in the Second World War has truly risen, "phoenix" like, to unparalleled economic success. The Japanese success story has one variable that we must take to heart: education. As Meri White, author of Japanese Education, observes, the Japanese secret weapon in the global economy is education. Japan has made a reality of high quality mass education, and has the most well trained workforce in the world.

There is a cause and effect relationship at work here which we ignore at our peril. In the modern, knowledge intensive economy, the secret of economic success is what a people "know and are able to do." A poorly educated workforce simply cannot cope in the modern world, and a country with a poorly educated workforce cannot continue to provide its citizens with the quality of life to which we have become accustomed.

We must have schools that produce students who can think for a living. We must learn how to work "smarter." We need an education system that serves all our children well, not just the lucky few. This is especially important at a time in our history when a decided demographic tilt is taking place -- more youngsters come from disadvantaged backgrounds than ever before, and we must bring them into both the political and economic mainstream. These students, who have been a focus of federal attention, now more than ever, need first-class teachers.

The issue before us is not to imitate the competition, but to meet it. Once our schools were the envy of the world. They can be once again.

To restore and revitalize American education, however, we must make it a national priority. Note the word national: this is not a task for one level of government alone; indeed, it is not a task for governments alone. It is a task for the nation as a whole. We must all play a role, and we must each play the role we play best.

We must, for example, commit more resources to education; but by resources I do not mean dollars alone. And, I do not mean federal government dollars alone. The task is bigger than that. It must involve all Americans.

We must commit our intellectual and political resources to education -- as well as our financial resources -- if we are to regain our competitive edge. As you know, education is first and foremost a state and local responsibility. The federal role is necessarily modest. Ultimate responsibility for education is vested in the 50 states, and Washington cannot -- should not -- assume responsibility for the major portion of education funding.

But there are things that Washington can and should do. Washington should continue, in the great tradition of Justin Morrill, father of the land grant colleges, to support higher education, including basic and applied research with national and international implications.

So too should Washington continue the mandate of the very first Department of Education, to gather statistics which permit us to determine how well -- or how poorly -- we are doing. And Washington must continue to deliver on its promise to help the disadvantaged and handicapped. These are accomplishments for which we may all be justifiably proud.

The time, however, has come for a new and novel proposal, one which is in the best American tradition. It involves cooperation between the public and the private sector; it relies on self-help as it lays the foundations for long term growth and development; and it represents a vote of confidence in our nation's teachers and the profession of teaching. Long discussed as a promising idea but never implemented, the creation of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in 1987 was a landmark event.

The Board is composed of 63 distinguished Americans, a majority of whom are teachers and one-third of whom are leaders from other sectors of American life; state and local government, business and industry, higher education and community affairs. The mission of the National Board is straightforward: to develop and administer a system of voluntary advanced certification for teachers in the same way that other professionals -- such as architects, accountants and physicians -- have set high and rigorous standards to assure high quality practice.

Sad but true, the fact is that most of the nation's teachers are still, by and large, seen as assembly line workers. The work of our finest teachers, with few exceptions goes unrecognized and unrewarded. Those who are professionals -- and thankfully there are many -- are professionals in spite of, not because of, the system. My colleagues and I on the National Board are convinced that this must change.

The creation of the Board means that it is beginning to change. I am convinced that teachers and their allies must be bold; they must seize the initiative, and demonstrate that there is a profession called "teaching," one that is due great respect. The National Board is a first step to see that this comes to pass.

3

The Board has been making steady progress over the last 18 months; a diverse group of individuals has reached agreement on the main features of the Board's standards without compromising in the slightest its vision of accomplished teaching. A lean but excellent staff has been put in place, and private sector fund raising is well underway, lead by Richard Heckert of DuPont and David Kearns of Xerox.

Professional certification of teachers which was only a dream in the early eighties, will be a reality in the early nineties. The die is cast; the work of the Board will go forward, and it will go forward successfully. Indeed, the only serious question about the Board's work is its pace: how long will it take to provide the option of Board certification for all the nation's teachers?

If this Board were to follow the footsteps of medicine, the answer would be decades. Starting in 1914, ophthalmologists created the first medical board, and others followed over the years. Indeed, as the frontiers of medical knowledge continue to push forward, new, and as yet unknown, medical boards will undoubtedly be created. This approach, of gradually building standards and assessments in one field and then moving on to another, is one teaching could follow. But I am convinced to do so would be a serious mistake. To do so would forfeit a great and important opportunity, the opportunity to leap ahead in education reform.

And make no mistake -- it is from teachers and teaching that real and lasting education reform will flow. All the statutes and all the rules and all the regulations in the world are not as important as a teaching force marked by excellence. Having written my share of laws during my tenure as a lieutenant governor and governor, I know there is no substitute for knowledgeable, skilled and caring teachers when our children and youth show up for school in the morning.

The National Board deals explicitly and directly with one of the most vexing problems in contemporary education -- the incentives for excellence in teaching are nil. The result is that first rate college and university graduates find teaching an unattractive option; good teachers already in the profession are tempted to leave -- and many do; the excellent teachers we are fortunate enough to keep find that their effort and talent go unappreciated and underutilized.

The overall impact on the schools is impossible to measure, but all observers agree that the problem is acute. The overall quality of the teaching force is much lower than it should be, and the schools operate less efficiently than they could. It is nothing less than a crisis, particularly in an era which demands greater productivity from the schools.

The National Board will be an important part of the answer. Its principal task is to develop and put in place high and rigorous standards and assessments to measure what teachers should know and be able to do to teach effectively. A National Board certificate will recognize a level of accomplishment beyond that conferred by a state license: it will be the imprimatur of the teaching profession itself. While the states will continue their important role of protecting the public interest by setting minimum standards for beginning teachers, the Board will establish a new target for experienced teachers.

Part of the Board's rationale is a recognition that no matter how fine a teachers initial preparation, accomplished practice takes time to emerge. Talk to any masterful teacher and they will tell you how they struggled during their early years of teaching translating theory into practice; how it was not until they had several years of teaching under their belt that they gained perspective, that their capacity to understand their students' needs matured and that they became accomplished at rendering professional judgments.

Consequently, the Board's vision of what makes for accomplished teaching extends substantially beyond accumulating course credits and demonstrating command of the basic skills which are the focus of state licensing requirements. The Board is designing a certification system that will recognize teachers who:

- o are committed to students and understand how they develop and learn;
- o know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students;
- o can effectively manage and monitor student learning;
- o think systematically about their practice and learn from experience; and
- o can work productively with parents and other professionals.

The Board recognizes and respects the diversity and pluralism that characterizes American education. Consequently, it will not select one method of teaching or one approach to curriculum for endorsement, but will design standards and assessment processes that value a teacher's capacity to make independent and sound professional judgments, that recognize that in many circumstances there are multiple approaches to instruction that are appropriate and defensible, and that reflect the reality that as a community's curricular objectives vary and the mix of students shifts these factors themselves will often call for vastly different teaching strategies.

The Board's assessment procedures must be professionally acceptable, publicly credible, legally defensible and administratively feasible. This demands assessments that go beyond paper and pencil testing. Procedures must be developed to determine not only what teachers know, but also to evaluate what they are able to do. Can they translate complex materials into language students understand? Can they exercise sound and principled professional judgement in the face of uncertainty, and can they act effectively on such judgments? Assessments that can recognize the complexity of teaching and reflect the diversity of American education must be able to accommodate the possibility that there will often be more than one appropriate approach to convey a particular idea, concept or theory to students, and also accommodate the prospect that as the number and mix of students varies so too might a teacher's practice.

The assessment methodologies and technologies that the Board needs can not readily be taken off-the-shelf. Consequently, the Board will be breaking new ground. It will explore the feasibility of assessment center exercises, of interactive videos, in-depth interviews, portfolios that are defended orally, simulations and on-site classroom observations along with other state-of-the-art ideas.

We are not designing another test, but an assessment process that includes a mix of assessment methodologies and technologies. In contrast to state licensing exams which tend

to focus on a narrow band of the many factors that account for accomplished practice and often assume that there is only one right answer, the Board is committed to a vision of teaching that is much broader in what it values and that recognizes that one of the hallmarks of effective practice is a rich repertoire of teaching methods to accommodate the diversity of students that a teacher typically confronts. So while a narrowly gauged test will screen out candidates who may be weak in one phase of teaching, a more broadly drawn assessment may find that some of these candidates have strengths in other areas that more than compensate for a single weakness. Employing multiple assessment methodologies should also produce fairer judgments, as the likelihood will decrease that the assessment technology itself will distort the certification decision.

The Board's orientation is not to surprise or trick candidates. We will be designing several vehicles to inform candidates about the Board's standards and assessment practices. Seeking Board-certification should be a learning experience that has a positive effect on the candidate's practice. While this focus should benefit all prospective candidates, it may particularly foster the Board's objective of seeing minority teachers well represented in the ranks of Board-certified teachers. While there is evidence that well-prepared minority teachers will demonstrate competence on any fair assessment, the Board is also aware of the history of below-average performance by minorities on standardized tests and of the many well-documented cases of test bias.

The first question people are legitimately concerned with is test bias. The Board shares this concern and will take a number of steps to guard against such problems, beginning with the active involvement of minorities in all phases of the Board's policy making, research and development. Second, the assessment processes itself will, by virtue of its much higher fidelity to teaching practice, inherently be fairer to all candidates. Third, the Board will work to see that minority candidates are well informed about the Board's expectations and processes, about how best to prepare for certification and about the steps the Board has taken and will continue to take to address issues of test bias and adverse impact. Our objective is to ensure that no teacher declines to seek Board-certification out of a concern that the assessment process is unfair.

To broaden and strengthen the pool of minority candidates, the Board will develop close working relationships with historically Black colleges and universities and other institutions that enroll large numbers of minority students as these institutions attempt to get their students and graduates ready for Board certification.

The shortage of minority teachers, however, is not just the result of teacher testing. At its core is the fact that far too few minorities acquire a baccalaureate degree, and that of those who do, the opportunity for a rewarding career outside of teaching is substantial. It is here that the Board may have its most positive effect on the minority teacher shortage. That is, as Board-certification serves as a catalyst to transform the essentials of teaching as a career, it holds the potential of attracting and holding a larger share of minority college graduates. And, as the Board leads to improved student learning it holds the promise of expanding the pool of minority college graduates -- a goal worth working toward not just for the schools' sake, but for the future of the nation.

The task before the Board is daunting: it is complex, it is time consuming and it will be expensive. But it can be done. My fellow board members and I are convinced that we know enough to move forward vigorously and successfully; indeed, the time for more basic research is past. The times demand action.

You know how high the stakes are; I know how high they are. We must act decisively, we must act now. If we fail to act history will judge us harshly.

It is for this reason that I appear before you today, to add my voice to the chorus of dedicated teachers and parents who share the board's conviction that we must seize the moment. What is involved in "seizing the moment?" Forging ahead on a broad front, simultaneously. We cannot afford to wait for piece meal reform, we need reform whole cloth. To do so we need federal funding; not, I may assure you, large dollar amounts. And neither do we ask for operating funds.

Rather, we propose a one-time, three-year authorization, designed to get the National Board off to a running start. The private sector is already reaching deeply into its pockets but we need a federal partner. We are not proposing esoteric research, but are building a system that will work, that the public will trust, that will inspire confidence in state legislatures and school boards and that will be seen as professionally credible and fair by the nation's teachers.

In many ways the size, scope and ambition of this initiative is unprecedented. But let me put this request for $25 million in some perspective. As the Board conducts its research and development program over the next five years, it represents less than one-tenth of 1% of what federal expenditures for elementary and secondary education will be if you held federal appropriations at current levels. And, you and I know that you are going to increase expenditures for education for we both recognize how important it is to the nation's future.

Just think of the potential return on investment. Businesses that seek to remain competitive in high technology markets see investments in research and development as absolutely essential to their survival. Typically, they commit funds on the order of several percentage points of revenue to research and development to secure their future. In an arena where knowledge is truly power, can we afford to do any less? Do you believe for a moment that the federal investment in compensatory education is returning all that it could? Just imagine the potential for improvement in the education of at-risk kids if the quality of teaching improved and the schools made quite deliberate efforts to take much better advantage of the able professionals now laboring in America's classrooms.

The Board presents an opportunity for a new partnership between the federal government and its citizens. It is a partnership designed not to improve the circumstances of a special interest group, but to improve the life chances of all Americans. It will do so because improvements in teaching have only one purpose: to improve the education of the nation's children.

I hardly need point out to this committee one other aspect of such an appropriation; matched dollar for dollar by the private sector, it represents both good value and good

practice. It places incentives where they should be, with the Board, both to raise additional funds and to husband and use those funds prudently.

As you may know, the request before you is to fund a matching grant program to underwrite the research and development which will undergird the certification process. The Board will not be conducting its research and development activities in-house. Rather, it will direct such funds to teams of scholars and teachers following a process of public notice, competition and merit review. Not one dollar of federal funds will be targeted to any specific university or other research institution. The Board's research agenda, competitive processes and study designs will be reviewed by both an external Advisory Council made up of leading experts in teaching and related fields and the Secretary of Education, and be open to public comment and scrutiny. The proposal before you is for hard headed, practical work that will bear fruit in the near term future. In sum, it involves:

- Setting standards and developing assessments in 29 distinctly different fields. Committees will be convened in each field, appropriate methodologies and technologies tested and cost-effective assessment processes developed. Reliability, validity and cost studies will be conducted. Determinations of the extent to which multiple measures of particular competencies should be employed also must be made.

- Conducting cross-cutting studies on advanced technologies, legal issues, scoring procedures and the practices of other professions and their transportability to teaching. Criteria will also be developed and tested for the selection of examiners, and then training programs and quality control mechanisms will be created to insure that the judgments rendered by Board examiners are fair, reliable and just.

- Addressing a host of issues regarding the operation of a national certification system. This includes determining the number, type and location of assessment centers the Board will need; building information management systems to handle a substantial flow of applicant data; and identifying the most efficient means to communicate with all teachers about the Board's standards and assessment requirements.

Finally, there is the question of the private sector; if there is to be a national board, why not a board constituted by the national government? The answer is straightforward, no one wants to see the federal government setting professional teaching standards. The logic line that leads to the Board begins here. If the establishment of a system of national professional certification is to proceed expeditiously the research and development tasks must proceed in unison. They cannot be unpackaged. They must be coordinated, for there are a series of interactive decisions regarding standards and assessment processes that the Board must make on a tight timetable if it is to meet its goal of a 1993 start-up.

Having the federal government develop and coordinate such a research project would necessarily entangle it in the development of teaching standards. If the goal of offering advanced certification to teachers is to be achieved in the next few years, some

non-government entity must be charged with the responsibility of designing and administering the certification process. At present, there is no other entity besides the National Board capable of successfully establishing a certification process in a timely and acceptable manner.

The federal government's role in education traditionally has included research and development that serves the interest of the entire nation. In keeping with this framework, a bipartisan coalition of senators has introduced legislation that is structured to protect the Board's independence to set its own standards and assessment processes, while the taxpayers' need for accountability is scrupulously satisfied. I believe honoring the twin aims of independence and accountability is appropriate and essential.

Using an independent organization as a vehicle for federal investment is not a new concept. Congress uses such non-government and quasi-government organizations where detailed federal direction and control is inappropriate. For example, Congress funds the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), a private organization designed to operate independent of political interference. The CPB provides grants to stations to support local programs and contracts for the production and procurement of other programs. The Senate Commerce Committee explained that there "is general agreement that ... federal financial assistance is required to provide the resources necessary for quality programs ... [but] this assistance should in no way involve the Government in programming or program judgments."[1]

The Board represents a new vehicle to address critical public policy issues that is both necessary and welcome. Noted Brookings economist Charles L. Schultze, former head of President Carter's Council of Economic Advisors, published The Public Use of Private Interest in 1977. It is no surprise that this elegant and closely reasoned book is a steady best seller, for Schultz makes the point that the larger part of the American genius has been to harness private interest in the public good. No other people does this so well and so easily; it is a tribute to the vitality and energy of the American political and economic system. I think the National Board is an example, par excellence, of this at work.

We have been encouraged in our efforts by the strong support we have received from a wide range of leaders of the American education community. From the outset, the Board has enjoyed the endorsement of the National Governors' Association, the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association. Support for federal investment in the Board's research and development program has also come from the American Association of School Administrators, American Education Research Association, Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of Secondary School Principals and National Association of State Boards of Education.

In closing, I would reiterate that time is of the essence. From the perspective of governors, state legislators, school board members and parents we cannot act fast enough. The country needs this Board now because the job of improving American education cannot wait. At the same time, we will not jeopardize the probability of building a high-

[1] S. Rep. No. 222, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967).

quality system by cutting corners. We plan to move ahead as rapidly as possible to put in place a first-class research and development program and do the job right without taking one more day than necessary.

The creation of the Board is an unprecedented event. It represents an unparalleled opportunity to stimulate a renaissance in schooling and learning. Help us get off to a running start and make this dream a reality by authorizing federal assistance to the National Board.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you, Governor. Dr. Magrath is president of the University of Missouri System. Nice to see you here, Doctor. Please proceed.

Dr. MAGRATH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have written testimony. I would hope that it could be put in the record.

My name is Peter Magrath. I am president of the University of Missouri which is a four-campus university system which includes, by the way, three colleges of education. I want to indicate that I am not a member of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards and I am here because I am deeply concerned and also very excited by the opportunity that this legislation and this proposal means for our nation.

I am opposed unalterably to a Federal curriculum. I am opposed to Federal certification of teachers. I am opposed to Federal control of our nation's schools. I am very much in favor of a national commitment to improve teaching standards and the profession.

I am very much in favor of what this board is trying to accomplish and I believe it is not just a nice thing, an important thing because education is something we all talk about and I hope we believe in, but I believe that we have a great opportunity, as well as a great danger in front of our nation and I am not going to go into a lot of rhetoric, but we all can get hyped real quick when there is a big oil spill in Alaska or when a space shuttle blows up or when an airplane goes down.

Well, we have, I think, both a crisis and a challenge with regard to teacher education. It is complex. You gentlemen know that far better than I do; we all know it is complex. There are many dimensions to it. Certainly teacher salaries is one of them, but one critical issue is that our teaching profession, what we call it, is not treated and does not work as a profession.

Again, the reasons are very complex, but we don't have the standards and we don't have the national emphasis that I believe is urgently needed if we are going to not only have good adequate teachers but excellent teachers that set a standard for competition.

You might wonder what is the interest of a university president in this. Well, I think the interest is very simple. All of education ought to be a seamless web. I don't even like the term "higher education and lower education." All education is important.

We have a vested interest in our colleges and universities in getting the best possible students to come to us, so that we can then try to improve their education and build on it. One factor that dictates the quality of students that come to us is the quality of the teaching that they have received and the quality of the instruction they have received.

There are many elements there, but surely unless you have got top flight, world class teachers, you aren't going to have your best students come into our nation's colleges and universities. We can't do our work if we don't have good students coming to us. That brings you back to the teacher issue.

Second, we do have and we are going to continue to have a major responsibility for the education of teachers, and I think I can say having been in the work of education for a while that we have deficiencies and I am not proud of what our nation's colleges and universities have dore in the teaching of teachers, not to say that

there aren't excellent teaching education programs and very dedicated professionals here.

That has not been a priority area within our universities. I am just going to tell you that. It has not been a priority area for our nation and we have got a very important interest in upgrading our curriculums and our teaching education programs and I really believe that if this project moves, we have a chance to galvanize and reinvigorate and develop methods of teaching teachers that will help the nation's schools.

It is a thing that can bring us together in some very important ways. This proposal doesn't focus on the beginning teacher; it focuses on providing tests and standards for men and women that have been out in the profession for two or three years.

It focuses on upgrading skills and raising challenges just as we do with lawyers who typically start out as junior partners if they are in a standard law practice. Architects go through an apprenticeship period. Medical doctors go through a residency and training programs.

We are fundamentally not doing that in our teacher programs in the United States. I have heard this morning some of the concerns raised. I understand them. The grants that would be made though are competitive. If this is a sole-source thing, and I think it warrants further examination, Mr. Chairman, by you and the subcommittee, it is a very unique, very special sole-source.

It is not a Defense Department's sole-source contract. This is a very special circumstance and note that the grants that are made are competitive. Also, most of the effort will be on development and applied research. This is not just a theoretical thing to study, at least for another five or ten years, because I don't thing we can wait five or ten years.

I think the opportunity to recognize the importance of teaching as a profession and do something about it is absolutely critical. The signal you can send out today and in the weeks ahead will be a very powerful signal for those that have really invested in this effort and the effort is really our nation's competitiveness.

Mr. Chairman, those are my comments, except for one observation. Twenty-five million dollars is either nothing or it is everything. It is a lot of money; it really is and as you point out, when you have to balance between the demands before the Congress and the nation, it is an important amount of money, but note, it is a one time appropriation.

Twenty-five million dollars won't solve our teaching salary problems and other things in the nation's schools. No amount of Federal appropriation could do that and that is not the appropriate Federal role, but $25 million appropriation for this project matching with the private sector will be a powerful signal that will, I think, be the equivalent of $25 billion, if I can just come up off the top of my head.

Some years ago we heard about the nation at risk. I think you have a project here that I for one very much hope won't be a project at-risk because I deeply believe it is in the national interest.

Thank you for listening to me.

[The prepared statement of Dr. C. Peter Magrath follows:]

C. Peter Magrath, President
University of Missouri System
July 25, 1989

Testimony
House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify on behalf of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

My thesis today is ultimately simple and, yes, fundamental. I believe that the value, significance, and credibility of the teaching profession must be elevated on a national basis to a higher status, and I believe that the responsibility for elevating professional teaching standards is a shared responsibility, involving America's colleges and universities, members of the teaching profession, the private sector, labor and government. The point of our common concern should be that teaching and learning are so important that all of us who engage in the enterprise of education at all levels, elementary, secondary and collegiate, must recognize and act upon a shared responsibility to improve the standards of teaching, the effectiveness of the teaching profession, and, therefore, the quality and the outcomes that emerge from our nation's elementary and secondary schools. Professional teaching standards represent an issue of particular concern for American colleges and universities, for the quality of those who teach is one of the most powerful determinants of the quality of entering

college students. Intelligent, dedicated, and professional teachers who are well educated, with a respect for knowledge and a passion for learning, will have students who, in turn, will seek knowledge and understanding themselves.

Allow me to cite one of the many illustrations that reveal how our teachers in our nation's elementary and secondary schools do not have the professional status that they--and we--need for our society. Whereas accountants, nurses, engineers, architects, physicians, lawyers, and other professionals have a wide array of options through which to practice their professional skills, teachers are fundamentally limited to the act and profession of teaching--unless they seek "advancement" by becoming administrators. "Administrator" is not a dirty word, but if this is the only avenue or motive for increased recognition, prestige, compensation, and professional rewards, we have a serious problem. A friend and colleague of mine at the University of Missouri, who once taught high school English, recently made the following observation. He wrote: "Some excellent teachers, no doubt, seek advancement by aspiring to become administrators. While this may increase compensation, it removes many of our finest teachers from the act of teaching itself. Why can't teachers be rewarded for, be promoted for and be recognized for being teachers? Why can't the teaching profession develop means of recognition that will be attractive both to those who want to enter teaching as a profession, as well as to those who want to

commit themselves to a lifetime of professional growth and advancement?"

It is my considered opinion that teaching, unlike other professions, has not moved beyond entry level standards. Therefore, we give teachers nothing to aim for, with respect to continuing their individual professional development. I am firmly convinced that the National Board for Professional Standards will help solve this problem and thereby elevate the level of recognition for outstanding teachers as members of a respected profession.

In preparing for these comments, I looked at the teaching profession and compared it to other important professional fields. In doing so, I tried to think of the names of individual and outstanding professionals in business, medicine, law, science, and university level education. Without exception I was able to identify nationally recognized leaders in these professional fields. However, when I tried to name an outstanding professional teacher whose name would be known nationally, it became clear to me that teachers as individuals and teachers as a profession are not recognized and, therefore, the quality of their contribution to the quality of American life goes largely unnoticed both among the members of the public at large--but even more importantly and more tragically among members of the teaching profession itself.

Through the organization of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, it will be possible in the

future for the public and for members of the teaching profession to understand the major differences between an accomplished, professional, experienced teacher and a beginning practitioner.

Regardless of the quality of our teacher preparation programs, novice teachers still have a lot to learn when they enter the classroom. Talk to any masterful teacher, and they will tell you how awkward they were during their first years on the job, how often they fumbled and made mistakes, how it took time for them to mature as practitioners and decision makers, how it took time for them to build a repertoire of effective practice, and how it took time for them to become adept at exercising professional judgment.

Other recognized professions understand that it takes time to become proficient at translating theory into practice; that there is more to learn than can be crammed into a standard pre-professional preparation program; and that the knowledge base is continually growing and being refined. Learning for teachers cannot and should not end with the awarding of a professional degree. Again, in comparison with other professions, we note that architects demand an apprenticeship; physicians require internships and residencies; and accountants in most states demand several years of experience before being granting a young practitioner CPA status.

On the other hand, in teaching we typically saddle our novice teachers with a full measure of responsibility. It

is sink or swim, and many young people with the potential to be superb teachers sink. Those who survive the initial years often look back in wonder and amazement at what they were able to accomplish, and the rest of their teaching career will carry the imprint of their early years of practice.

We must offer better rewards to our professional teachers. We must elevate the targets that represent the hallmark of professionalism in the field. To some extent we can do this with additional graduate credit and with continuing professional education. But there is also a continuing lingering need to reward professionals for demonstrated competence in the field. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards offers the promise for this recognition, and this reward is so sorely needed by the teaching profession.

I believe an additional important contribution to be made by the Board would be to stimulate the academy to rethink teacher education programs, and this will be a good thing. Current practice of preparing elementary school teachers by concentrating on methods courses and skimping on subject matter is beginning to change, and it <u>needs</u> to change. In the case of secondary school teaching, we also need to balance the attention being given to subject matter and methods preparation. I believe the programs to be established by the Board will help achieve this balance at all levels of elementary and secondary education.

One of the most beneficial aspects of the Board will be its focus on experienced rather than beginning teachers. The Board will direct its attention and the attention of the profession, as well as the attention of higher education, to the continuing professional development of teachers. Our focus for too long has been upon the entry level needs of teachers; there is a need to shift our focus in a more balanced way to the quality of our experienced teachers.

Incidentally, I believe that the Board's focus on professional teaching standards will have a positive impact on teaching in higher education. This promises to be a healthy situation. For too long, most college and university presidents have given inadequate attention to the quality of teaching on our campuses. The Board, by recognizing that there is specific knowledge associated with the teaching of every subject, has already begun to affect the way we look at teaching in our own institutions.

Higher education has a special self-interest in wanting to see this Board succeed. We see the Board having a direct effect on the quality of student learning in American elementary and secondary schools. This means students better and more fully prepared for the challenge of college and university studies. At present, we devote an inordinate amount of resources to remedial education. This investment serves an important purpose--giving many students a second chance. But if these students arrived at the university doorstep ready for the advanced studies we are prepared to

offer, our time and effort and your substantial investment in student aid would yield much greater return than is the case today.

That is really what this Board is about--revitalizing teaching and improving student learning, increasing the odds of a sound return on our massive national investment in education, (an investment the American public is quite prepared to increase if there is some reasonable chance that the system will change), quality education for all--not just a small elite--thus making equal opportunity a reality, and not just a catch phrase.

In conclusion, I want to offer my strong support for the Congress to make this onetime investment in a highly targeted program of research and development. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is not another blue sky idea; it is a practical and bold initiative. The quality of health care in this country increased dramatically when high and rigorous standards were adopted for entry into the practice of medicine. Medical education was transformed in the process and the quality of practice was uplifted. A similar step must be taken in the profession of teaching. I am confident that the Board, working collaboratively with leaders of state and local government, union leaders and the academy, can spark a comparable leap forward in American education.

We have talked about this idea long enough; it is now time to act.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you very much. As you have noticed, Governor Hunt, you have been joined by Congressman Valentine. Tim, you listened to both testimonies and you know that Governor Hunt is here as chairman of the board. If you have a statement at this time, we would be very pleased to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. TIM VALENTINE, A REPRESENTATINE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Congressman VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for recognizing me. I will take about two minutes. I came here to introduce the former governor and I should have known that in this situation, as in most of his endeavors and enterprises particularly where they relate to education, he has been ahead of most of us in North Carolina, but he is my good friend.

He is my constituent and he has made such a contribution to the quality of life in our state that I would like to—I can't introduce him now. He has made his statement, but I want to take these one or two minutes to say to my colleagues here some things about Jim Hunt.

He served for four years as Lieutenant Governor of our state and two terms, eight years, as governor. I can think of fewer stronger or more effective advocates of education in the United States than Jim Hunt.

As governor of North Carolina, he established the North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics which I believe to be a national model. He established the microelectronics center of North Carolina, the North Carolina Business Committee for Education and he commissioned the planning for the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching.

Jim Hunt has also chaired the National Task Forces on Technological Innovation and Education for Economic Growth. He is vice chairman of the board of the National Center for Education and the Economy and he currently serves as chairman of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and it is in this last role that he comes here before this subcommittee today.

Jim Hunt improved education in North Carolina and he can help improve education across the nation. I am happy to introduce him to you in retrospect. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you, Tim. We appreciate it and I know Governor Hunt appreciates your presence here. Questions. Mr. Coleman?

Mr. COLEMAN. Thank you. Governor Hunt, as a representative of the board, I hope you will convey to the board our commendation for its efforts in regard to teacher professionalization. We appreciate, however the outcome of this bill, what you and the board are doing and commend your efforts and involvement in this process.

Peter, thank you for being here, and let me say in very forthright direct language, you stated what you favor and what you oppose. I think all of us can concur with the concerns that have been voiced here and how you have very candidly, straightforwardly answered those questions about Federal involvement and the question of the Federal role pre-empting the traditional state and local jurisdiction over public education.

Let me also say that we have heard that the Federal Government shouldn't be involved in this area of teacher standards. One of the three criticisms of the Secretary was that the department already conducts and that we don't need a national board. I think we have to sort through what we are involved with and what we are not involved with at the Federal level.

We are involved with research. We are involved with statistical analysis. We are involved with trying to put together some sort of model or framework in which to make an evaluation.

I believe that what the Secretary referred to as research funded by department grants in studies around the country is what this board wants to do nationally. Is that true, Governor Hunt?

Governor HUNT. That is true, Congressman. If I may add to that, though, while this is not for state licensing, state certification, that is a state rule. This is something to be high in rigorous standards, the kind we want to see all of our teachers move to and many of them are already there and ought to be recognized for that.

The purpose of this board would be to have basic research done, yes, and we will find what is around the country that we can already use, but then as President Magrath said, to develop assessments, to measure those high standards, that is something that nobody has ever done.

I think you are going to hear the research community and others say something about that today. We have never in this country set those high standards, determined what they ought to be in all these certificate fields, and then develop the array of assessments to measure of whether or not one meets those standards.

We aren't talking about just a pencil and paper test, true and false, multiple choice. Those are inadequate measures. We are talking about classroom observation. We are talking about developing assessment centers where we would bring prospective applicants in and have video simulations and all kinds of technology involved in assessing these teachers.

We are talking about using portfolios. There will be some written test or broad array to really find out who the excellent teachers are and to do it in a fair and accurate way. That has not been done before, Congressman, in this country's history and then, of course, we have to develop the products, the actual assessments, the measures to use so we can go right out there and starting doing it.

Most of what the Department does and its important work is very basic, fundamental kind of research. Most of what we are going to do will be to take that research, do some more and to use it to develop these instruments. That is why this is such a huge job, just a huge enterprise that has never been done before by the doctors or anybody else in this country and we are trying to do it in five years.

Mr. COLEMAN. Now, tell us what the final product would be after these means of evaluation are in place. Why is it important that we tell teachers through the certification process that they are an outstanding teacher? Here is the stamp of approval, in essence, that a teacher has reached the highest category of certification in this country.

Why is that an important distinction to a teacher and why is it important to me as a parent?

Governor HUNT. I think this goes to the heart of what a lot of people have asked about. That is important, first of all, because those excellent teachers deserve to be held out to the world. They deserve to have people know that they are that good and thousands of them are around this country today and nobody knows it and nobody appreciates it in the way they ought to be.

Second, the school boards and the administrators and the principals need to know who those top teachers are, so that they can then see that they are utilized in full professional ways in those schools. They can mentor younger teachers. They can help plan curriculum. They can work with their colleagues in all kinds of ways that we don't let teachers do today and we should.

This will mean that the schools of education will know what to do in preparing their—what are you going to prepare your students for? Is it those minimum low standards for state certification or is it to prepare them for those high standards that this board will certify?

The final thing I want to say about this is that when we talk about how we get the best and brightest to go into the classrooms, to go into teaching, the answer, I think, is that, yes, we have to pay them more. We have to pay them a lot more.

Up in Rochester, they are going to be paying them up to $60,000-$70,000 a year for the very top ones. I think that is great. We have also got to give them more professional opportunities as a person who is bright and able has in my law firm.

Now, if you have board certified teachers, you know that you can put them into these kinds of situations and I think that the young people of this country who now are opting to go into law, medicine, business, when they see a profession with these kinds of high standards where they are going to be paid more—that is a local decision, of course—where they are going to have greater professional opportunities, where they are going to be recognized as being among the tops, if they are a competitive type, if they are really good, I think they are going to want to go into that kind of profession, Congressman.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I know that my time is up. If we have time, perhaps after the rest of the panel has a chance to ask their questions, I might have another one or two questions for these gentlemen.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you. Mr. Poshard?

Mr. POSHARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me thank my good friend, Peter Smith, for clarifying for me, since I have not taken the time actually to look into the workings of this commission. My concerns are about Federal standards and involvements and I appreciate his clarification because that was a real concern of mine.

I want to ask some very practical questions. I started teaching 20 years ago this year and I started for $5,800 a year teaching five separate subjects and coaching three sports. My wife this year will go into her 17th year of teaching and she nearly has her master's degree and she just last year made $20 thousand a year, the first time.

So, I am a strong union supporter of teachers. I always have been because the only reason the little school is now paying $16 thousand a year where I started out at $5,800 is because the union

has been there and I am frankly concerned about the effect of merit pay and whether this is going down the road toward merit pay and that sort of thing.

I am just trying to be frank with you, Governor, about some of my own background experience. Tell me how the administrators are tied into this overall commission work—principals, assistant principals, superintendents.

Governor HUNT. Congressman, they will speak for themselves later, but let me say to you that I think they are thrilled to see the focus now turn to professionalism and high standards. That is what they want in their teachers. They want to be able to work with those teachers and their schools.

Mr. POSHARD. Yes, I understand that, but the point I am trying to make is, are they going to be going through the same certification process or looking at the same standards for themselves?

I ask that for this reason. As a teacher and an administrator for 14 years—I have seen both sides. When I was a teacher, I was an active experimentalist. I liked to get my kids involved with role playing. I liked to take them on field trips. I liked to get them involved in a lot of different kinds of things.

My administrator who judged my performance loved lecture and discussion. When he came to evaluate me every year, he sat in the back of my room and if I didn't have every kid in line in certain rows and have 15 questions to ask each kid and get a preconceived response, then I wasn't performing up to standard as far as he was concerned, even though I was working 15 hours a day with those children and thought I was getting them to learn everything.

I had poor evaluations as a teacher. I thought I was a darn good teacher. When I became an administrator, I spent a lot of time learning how kids learn. Some of them are active experimentalists, some of them are reflective observers, some are concrete, but primarily teachers teach in one fashion.

We try to broaden teaching styles to hit the perceptual screens of those students, so I didn't take the same attitude toward my teachers, that if they didn't teach the way I was most comfortable in teaching, they were poor teachers.

My concern is that we have got to do something about that and I don't want to see us go down the wrong road. I applaud what you are attempting to do, but how do we follow through to get administrators to see that teaching is dynamic? It is complex, it is creative and until we get them to see that, children aren't going to learn.

Governor HUNT. Congressman, you have made our speech for us. That is the kind of teacher we need in American schools. That is the kind of teacher that is going to make our kids creative and innovative, and that is the kind of teacher that is going to get board certification.

Now, administrators are changing in this country, Congressman. We have wonderful ones on our board. Their national organization has endorsed this effort because they know that we have got to have those kinds of teachers now. Furthermore, in the future, you are going to see board certified teachers who teach like that becoming principals and board certification will recommend them for that.

Mr. POSHARD. So, there will be linkages between the administrative aspects and the teaching components of what you are proposing.

Governor HUNT. Indeed, there will be and I might further add, that to measure those qualities in a teacher requires more than just a pencil and paper test, doesn't it?

Mr. POSHARD. That is the least of all.

Governor HUNT. Right, you see, we have got to do this research in what those things are. What are those attributes of an excellent teacher, knowing and being able to do. Then we have got to develop the assessments to measure them far more than a pencil and paper test. It is going to be the best assessment than America has. That is what we are going to be developing. Then, of course, once the teachers come in and sit for this they are assessed in these various kinds of ways and we board certify those who meet the standard. It is a huge, but exciting kind of enterprise.

Mr. POSHARD. If they are board certified, then it will be up to the local school district to determine how they want to treat that for whatever purpose, monetary or otherwise?

Governor HUNT. Strictly up to the local board and I might add, I have never seen anything come along. I think Congressman Coleman and maybe Smith were emanating this. This is not a new Federal program. We are not going to be in here every year for money. We are not putting in rules and regulations that people out there are going to have to abide by and fill out forms for.

This is a one time thing, a lever to stick in there and make the whole thing better. That is really what this is.

Chairman WILLIAMS. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. POSHARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to repeat. I think what the national board has done is outstanding in the area of excellence. Anything that you can do to get teacher certification institutions to do a darn side better job—and some are doing a better job. I had to laugh when you said administrators are changing. You better not tell that to my wife. She was just recently told that the school administrators had trouble with her teaching reading because she takes her children too far.

I suppose some second grade teacher complained she didn't know what to do with the kids because they are already through second grade reading. How lucky she should have been!

My whole concern remains that the $25 million that could be used to attract the brightest and best to the teaching profession. I am not talking about after they are there three, four, five years. I want to find a way to attract them to the profession. I can't tell them that if you get this national certificate, that is really going to do things for you, so you ought to go into this profession.

I have to find out some how to get the brightest and best to go into the profession, stay in the profession, and then I also have to find a way to make sure that they will go into the innercity, that they will go into rural America, and that is what I think our responsibility is on our level with this $25 million.

Now, you get your $25 million simply by AFT and NEA is all for it, $10 per teacher times two and a half million teachers, you've got

it made. There is your $25 million. My $25 million, in my estimation, has to be used somehow to attract the brightest and best to the profession and you can't use, "You'll get a better job if you have this national certificate down the line," to encourage them to come into the profession.

Again, if you had an oversupply of teachers as we do of lawyers, you could do all sorts of things, but I had to take teachers after World War II, and some of you have heard me say this many times, just by checking to see what the heartbeat was, because I had to fill classrooms and I wasn't in an affluent school district where maybe I could attract them much better.

We are back at that same point because now we have an increased birthrate. We have all of those teachers retiring and many states giving early out to reduce their budget so that they can hire cheaper people and get rid of those who are at the top of the scale, have a lot of pressure put on them to get them out, but again, I don't have that problem, if you are boarded off.

We talk about competition and then we always refer to Japan and that really blows my mind because Japan is not a melting pot. Japan, the whole thing from the parent is, excellence, excellence, excellence; we demand excellence, and then, if we don't get parents in the United States to demand excellence, I don't care what we do, we probably aren't going to make the grade, but we are talking about two totally different societies as we are with Western Europe.

I noticed that you used the one illustration as we politicians always do of the 750,000 that was given way back some time to one group. We didn't mention that there are 23 boards within there that are totally financed by the profession itself, not by Federal Government, so, again, I commend you for what you are doing. Any reform you can bring to teacher education is wonderful.

My whole argument is, "If I have $25 million, I want to use it to attract the brightest and best to the teaching profession," and above all, the comment that was made about the administration and supervision. I was both and I hope I didn't stifle creativity, but I sure saw an awful lot of it stifled by young people coming into the profession.

So, you can answer how you are going to take my $25 million and attract the brightest and best to the teaching profession, not keep them, not after they are there awhile, but get them to go there and get them to go into the innercity and rural America, then maybe you can sell me on, "That is $25 million well spent."

Dr. MAGRATH. The governor asked if I might try to respond and I would like to try to sell you on it, Mr. Goodling. The first point is if we can professionalize the teaching profession so that a reward for being a good teacher is reflected in higher salaries and in freedom and discretion to practice a profession.

That is one of the crying tragedies in the teaching profession and you alluded to it and I think you all have alluded to it that creativity is not recognized, it is not rewarded. Colleges and universities have it very different. Our faculties there basically run their own operation as independent professionals.

Our teachers and in our elementary and secondary schools by far and large don't have that discretion. Twenty-five million dollars

isn't enough to give the signal in terms of teacher salaries, et cetera, et cetera, no way that it is.

Remember, it is a one time appropriation we are discussing here, a $25 million commitment to support this project with the private sector. If the project works, I happen to believe it can work and that it will work, it will help to professionalize the teaching profession so that perspective teachers, students when they are in the elementary schools, when they are in the high schools, start saying, "Gee, if I am a teacher, I can be a really independent professional. I can do wonderful things with other people's minds. I can excite them. I can have freedom to lead," just as you as a congressman have certain degrees of freedom to be innovated and to pursue certain things within constraints, which we all have.

Our teachers in the elementary and secondary schools, by far and large, don't have that. By having a standard, a high standard of excellence that is demonstrated, you are giving a powerful signal that I think will be one of the things, it is not the only thing for heaven's sake, but it is one of the things that I think can help attract people into the profession that we desperately want.

That is the best answer that I can give you.

Mr. GOODLING. Let me give you one word of advice. In all that you do, please don't ever use the words "merit pay." I have told this President never to use the words "merit pay" for an education speech.

I was an administrator for 22 years. First of all, in the community, every teacher knew who the best teacher was. Every student knew who the best teacher was. Every parent knew who the best teacher was, but, boy, you try to differentiate their pay and that is a difficult thing. When the board says, "Okay, here is a $1000, spread this around to the best teachers," and I am going to upset the whole profession to give somebody a hundred bucks.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Let me use the prerogative of the chair here to end this line of questioning and the responses. The buzzers that you have just heard are alerting us that we have probably about 12 or 13 minutes remaining before a vote and I would like to conclude with this panel prior to that time.

Let me go now to a member of the Committee, Mr. Henry.

Mr. HENRY. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will make my comments very brief. It might be more in the nature of a comment, but also, a request of both our presenters. Obviously we are deeply appreciative of the work of your panel, but the thing that frustrates me is why we have to pay $50 million of public and private funds to figure out a way to circumvent an incorrigibly corrupt state certification process.

Why do we have to go around what both of you have said in your testimony is second-rate licensing? That is the problem with the whole thing. I have been in the State Board of Education in Michigan and by the way, Governor Hunt, I used some of your initiatives in things that I tried to push through in Michigan, so I have great regard, but I also understand the battle you had to fight for those things.

The administrators were against you sometimes and the union is against you. This is the most apparently uninnovative sector in American society, and in some ways, institutionally corrupt. That

is what this really is. It is an attempt to get around the corruption by building the superstructure of reform on the top because we fear we can't do it at the bottom.

I will give you real good examples. Dr. Magrath, at your University of Missouri, I presume you have about a dozen colleges in the university complex, one of which is probably College of Education. Do me the favor—I won't put you on the spot, but submit it for our record, let me know what the average SAT and ACT score is of all those who subsequently go into the various colleges.

Then, also give me the printout of what your average GPAs are and if you are typical of the national norm, the worse students of the entire lot are those majoring in physical education and going to schools of education. However they come out with higher GPAs than people going into our most competitive fields of law and medicine.

If your average are average, if you have reformed it, it will show, but give us the information.

Dr. MAGRATH. I will send it.

Mr. HENRY. What really gets me angry—I am not picking on you, because Michigan is the same or Michigan State. Michigan finally had to eliminate the School of Education to get around the problem. They couldn't reform it. That is really what happened at the Ann Arbor campus.

The unions didn't want it reformed. In Michigan ten years ago, we couldn't train teachers because the unions didn't want new ones coming in. I mean, that is what we have. In your case, Governor, and you have been a real reformer, I know you have, but I bet you in North Carolina today, the high school teacher of physics and chemistry, still have less training in science of physics or the science of chemistry than an ordinary bachelor of science of degree in chemistry or physics in terms of knowledge of field.

The teacher of mathematics has had less math than an ordinary B.S. in math; a teacher of English, less English because they are so swallowed up in credentialism. What really frustrates me about this, and you can see that I see what you are trying to do and I am for you, but why don't we start by reforming that lousy licensing process in our 50 states?

Governor HUNT. Congressman, we tried it and we haven't been very successful, have we?

Mr. HENRY. So, this is an act of desperation——

Governor HUNT. No, no—well, you can say that. I think there are a lot of other good things that are going to happen and we have talked about them, but I think you are going to see changes in state licensing, state certification when this happens.

You talked about the kinds of things these teachers ought to be taking who are science teachers, you are going to have to take those things and be accomplished in them if you are going to become board certified and that is what folks are going to start aiming for, you see?

That is why bright young people are going to be attracted into it. They are ready for a tough challenge. None of my four children have chosen to go into teaching, even though my wife is a teacher, I have a teaching certificate in vocational agriculture, and when I talk to them, it is because they don't see this as being a profession

that has high standards, is challenging, is appreciated and respected in the community.

This is going to change that. You will never spend $25 million and get the kind of change in the system that I think you would get from this and it, of course, would be matched by the private sector.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Mr. Smith, do you want to take one minute and conclude with this——

Mr. SMITH. I will take less than that. I would appreciate it if you could have the staff or someone submit in writing how it is that you negotiated with the AFT and NEA around the issue that Mr. Poshard has raised and has been brought up again.

We call it merit pay or you can call it career ladders and you can call it whatever. You have said where the decision will be made, at the local school board, but, obviously, as I remember it, there is real concern as to whether we are going to get the teaching unions involved around the issue of the consequences of having a national board licenser certification.

If you could educate us a little bit as to what those conversations were in writing for the record, I think that would be very helpful.

Governor HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I can't speak for Mary Futrell and Al Shanker—I wish so much they could have been here today, because they would be so much more impressive than I would be or perhaps some of the rest of us.

I do want to tell you that things are changing. They really are changing in this country, and that is why we need to catch this tide now. We have the chance to do it; we really do, and it will change the whole future of this country, our economy, our competitiveness, and everything else.

I think that the leaders of our two great national teacher's organizations realize that to save our schools we have got to do this kind of thing, know that the decisions about how much to pay will be made at the local level, that they won't be made on some kind of favoritism basis, you know, the principal's pet which has given merit pay a bad name, but will be based on real things.

We now pay more to people who have a master's degree. Whatever, you know, how well they have done, we could pay more if you are a board certified teacher. That would be logical; that would be reasonable. Everybody would understand that and support it, I believe.

Mr. SMITH. I just think it would help the Committee to see in writing for the record some of those things so they could look at it.

Governor HUNT. We will get that for you.

[The information follows:]

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SYSTEM
Columbia, Kansas City, Rolla, St. Louis

INTER-DEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

September 19, 1989

TO: Colleen Thompson
U.S. House of Representatives Committee
on Post Secondary Education

FROM: Ron Turner

RE: Mr. Henry's request for information for hearing record.

1. How do the average ACT scores of University of Missouri education students compare with those going into other campus schools and colleges?

In 1989 the average ACT composite score of College of Education students at the University's Columbia campus (UMC) was 23.2. The campus norm was 23.

2. What are the comparable grade point averages (GPA's)?

College of Education students take substantial numbers of credit hours in liberal arts courses. The mean GPA of the College of Education graduates in 1989 was 3.12.

3. Conclusion

Students entering the UWC College of Education have higher GPA's than the student body as a whole, and, in turn, their grades are above average.

RJT:sj

National Board
FOR PROFESSIONAL
TEACHING STANDARDS

October 13, 1989

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

JAMES B. HUNT JR.
Chair
CLAIRE L. PELTON
Vice Chair
JAMES A. KELLY
President
MARY DEAN BARRINGER
LEWIS M. BRANSCOMB
ALAN K. CAMPBELL
ERIC CARL
IVY M. CHAN
JAMES P. COMER
ERNESTO J. CORTES JR.
JOSEPH D. DELANEY
MARTHA F. DOLFI
KAREN DREYFUSS
JOEL AARON FINK
CLIFFORD L. FREEMAN
S. K. FRETWELL, JR.
MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL
CHARLEYNE A. GILBERT
BARBARA B. HATTON
RICHARD E. HECKERT
SONIA HERNANDEZ
JOSEPH NGUYEN-TRUNG HIEU
SHIRLEY A. HILL
PATRICIA C. HODGES
BILL HONIG
SUE HOVEY
NANCY L. JEWELL
ANN F. KAHN
SUSAN ADLER KAPLAN
VERA KATZ
THOMAS H. KEAN
DAVID T. KEARNS
NATHANIEL N. LeCOUR, JR.
JUDITH E. LANIER
PEGGY J. LATHLAEN
ESTHER S. LAUDERMAN
BARBARA B. LAWS
KATHERINE P. LAYTON
HAYES A. LEWIS
SUSAN M. LLOYD
A. ROBERT LYNCH
HELEN E. MARTIN
DEBORAH MEIER
DAMON P. MOORE
JAMES R. OGLESBY
PATRICK F. O'ROURKE
REBECCA ANN PALACIOS
THOMAS W. PAYLANT
RUTH E. RANDALL
DORIS D. ROETTGER
LEONARD ROVINS
MARY BUDD ROWE
FRANKLIN D. SCHLATTER
PHILLIP C. SCHLECHTY
THOMAS F. SEDGWICK
ALBERT SHANKER
SUSAN A. STITHAM
EDITH SWANSON
PEGGY SWIGER
IRENE PHELPS THOSMAN
VICKI R. TUSANO
ADAM URBANSKI
REG WEAVER
TERRY L. WYATT

OFFICES

DETROIT
200 WEST FORT STREET
SUITE 1670
DETROIT MICHIGAN 48226
313 961-0520

WASHINGTON D.C.
1200 19th STREET NW
SUITE 401
WASHINGTON DC 20036
202 466-2500

The Honorable Peter P. Smith
United States House of Representatives
1020 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-4501

Dear Congressman Smith:

I appreciated the opportunity to testify in July before the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education on behalf of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). And I was gratified by your appearance at the hearing, as well as by the interest in the Board which you have shown. The following is provided in response to the question you posed at the hearing regarding the involvement of the NEA and the AFT in NBPTS Certification.

The National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers care deeply about the future of this profession. Officials from these two organizations, as well as leaders from other segments of education, have worked together in harmony over the past two years to make the Board a success.

Both the NEA and AFT know that the Board's role and function is limited and that the effect of NBPTS Certification will depend on the trust and confidence that the system of standards and assessments that is now under development inspires in teachers and in the public. NBPTS Certification will be a catalyst for education reform and improvement all across the nation. However, the Board will not prescribe how states and localities should encourage teachers to seek certification, nor how Board certification should be recognized and rewarded. These are decisions best worked out by those with responsibility for the governance and management of American education. These questions will, quite properly, become the subject of negotiations between unions and school boards and will be considered by state legislatures and state boards of education.

With 50 states, 14,000 school districts, 1,200 schools of education and 2.5 million teachers, the Board expects to see great variety in both the pace and the form of response to NBPTS Certification. However,

having built a broad base of support, and having all the players represented at its table, the Board believes that NBPTS Certification will complement the work of dedicated Americans all across the nation who are committed to strengthening the schools, and will prove to be a powerful stimulus for improvement in American education.

I trust that this answer is responsive. Again, we thank you for the interest you have shown in the Board.

Sincerely,

James B. Hunt, Jr.
Chair

cc: The Honorable Pat Williams
Chairman, House Subcommittee
on Postsecondary Education

Chairman WILLIAMS. Dr. Magrath and Governor Hunt, we are very appreciative of you being with us. I will recess this hearing. We will try to return for our final panel in about ten minutes.

Governor HUNT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Recess was taken.]

Chairman WILLIAMS. We reconvene this hearing and ask the three members of panel three to join us: Dr. Wise, Dr. Larsen, and Dr. Smith.

Dr. Wise is the director of the Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession at the Rand Corporation and is here representing the American Education Research Association. Dr. Wise, please proceed.

STATEMENTS OF DR. ARTHUR WISE, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION, RAND CORPORATION, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN EDUCATION RESEARCH ASSOCIATION; DR. MAX LARSEN, PRESIDENT, NEBRASKA BOARD OF EDUCATION, LINCOLN, NB, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION; AND DR. MARGARET A. SMITH, SUPERINTENDENT, HEMPFIELD AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT, GREENSBURG, PA REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Dr. WISE. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I have testimony which I hope will be put into the record.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Without objection, all of the prepared statements of each of our witnesses will be in the hearing record.

Dr. WISE. The Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession is an organization which conducts numerous studies concerned with the status of the teaching profession and has issued a number of reports which have been widely cited, including at this hearing already today.

In my opinion, the legislation before you responds to a pressing national need to help attract and retain talented people in teaching. It is part of a broad national movement to professionalize teaching, to make teaching the kind of job which talented people will want to have.

As part of a broad package of reforms, this initiative will, I think, transform what is now a low-level occupation of teaching into the kind of field which talented young people will want to go.

It accompanies such other reforms as reform of the teacher education system. That reform is now underway as our schools of education are looking to new ways to better prepare people for the important task of teaching.

It accompanies reform of the teacher licensing process at the state level. That process which will be influenced by the national board is a process which is necessary to assure us that all teachers have at least minimum skills before they begin to practice independently.

It accompanies such reforms as the restructuring of schools which will result in accommodating, encouraging, and requiring the professional practice of teaching, so that all students are taught appropriately to their needs.

It would create a national certification system to recognize advanced teaching competence. This and other measures to award professionalism and provide market sensitive compensation will change the way we look at teaching in America today.

The board's research and development will, of course, lead directly to the board's certification assessment system, but it would also advance the other reforms so essential to making teaching the kind of job that talented people will want to have.

The American Educational Research Association with the membership of 15,000 is approaching its 75th anniversary. Among the principles it has pursued over this period is encouragement of open robust competition in the award of Federal research grants and concomitantly a strong opposition in general sole-source awards.

Consequently, it was only after considerable deliberation that the Association reached its present position of support for the national board's proposal to seek funds from the Federal Government to conduct a substantial program of research and development.

Members of this subcommittee will note that the Association takes the position that the unique circumstances associated with the mission of the national board is what makes this case so compelling.

This is an enterprise which will only take place after a large initial investment which is necessary for the board to begin its operational phase. It is that circumstance which makes Federal investment in this enterprise so essential.

In addition, the Association provided eight recommendations to the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities which it felt would assure on the one hand necessary independence from Federal influence and on the other hand, that research funds would be utilized in such a manner to ensure competition, merit review, independent scholarship and the continuous oversight by the scientific community.

We conclude that the legislation introduced in January 1989 by Senator Dodd, S. 478, substantially meets these concerns and recommendations. In other words, that they balanced for the competing considerations which we have heard discussed this morning of autonomy for the board on the one hand and of accountability to the Federal Government for the fruit and expenditure of Federal funds.

This balance is necessary in order to affect what will be the result, the creation of an independent National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Our Association is comfortable with the legislative response thus far provided to its concerns regarding necessary independence and adherence to the canons of merit review.

Therefore, I would like to make but two additional points. First, concerning the importance of the National Board's Research and Development Program.

The apparently simple idea of assessing teacher competency becomes remarkably complex as soon as one begins to contemplate the number of subject areas, grade levels, and the disciplines to be assessed and the number and variety of teaching situations encountered in elementary and secondary education.

It is not one assessment system that must be designed. It is, in fact, 20 or 30 assessment systems that must be designed at one time.

It should be disturbing to all of us that no teacher evaluation system now in use anywhere in the United States comes close to identifying advanced teaching competencies in a reliable and valid manner and one of the important spinoffs of the national board's work will be a major influence on the way in which teacher evaluation is conducted in the United States.

The product of the board's research and development will also be helpful to states which are seeking to improve their assessment procedures and will result in major new influences on the curriculum of colleges of education.

Thus, the support of this R&D agenda is important to get the board off and running, but it is also valuable in its own right in the kind and ways in which it will influence much of the rest of the reform agenda in teaching today.

I believe that we can produce the teacher assessment system required to make the national board succeed. It will require a major R&D effort, unparalleled in our nation's educational research and development history.

A $50 million budget dedicated to one task is something that we have never tried in American educational research.

What we have pursued instead over the years is a spread the approach or spread the money concept where we try to dedicate a little bit of research money to a whole host of problems and, in fact, the way the Department distributes its funds now through the center of competition, no subject area receives much more than a million or so dollars worth of research and development activity a year.

So, we are talking about something on a much grander scale. Nonetheless, I remain optimistic that the board can design an assessment system that will work. A comparative look at assessment procedures in such other professions as medicine and architecture is reassuring.

The field of educational measurement has progressed quite a bit in the last several years and we are quite able to carry out our work in a much more sophisticated manner than is now the case with paper and pencil examinations.

Technology can be brought to bear and last, but not least, research supported by the Federal Government, particularly when it had in operation the National Institute of Education, produced volumes of research that can be brought to bear on this important task.

Thank you very much for your attention.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Arthur E. Wise follows:]

American Educational
Research Association

TESTIMONY OF DR. ARTHUR E. WISE ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION. GIVEN BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, JULY 25, 1989, WASHINGTON D.C.

Good morning. I am Arthur Wise, Director of the Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession at the RAND Corporation and Chairman of the Government and Professional Liaison Committee of the American Educational Research Association.

The American Educational Research Association, with a membership of 15,000, is approaching its 75th anniversary. Among the principles it has pursued over this period is encouragement of open, robust competition in the award of federal research grants and, concomitantly, opposition to sole-source awards. Consequently, it was only after considerable deliberation that the Association reached its present position of support for the National Board's proposal to seek funds from the federal government to conduct a substantial program of research and development. Members of the Subcommittee will note (attached) that the Association takes the position that the unique circumstances associated with the mission of the National Board and the compelling need to provide a research and development base adequate to the task of identification of advanced teacher competencies justified this unusual funding approach.

In addition, the Association provided eight recommendations to the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities which it felt would assure, on the one hand, necessary independence from federal influence and, on the other hand, that research funds would be utilized in such a manner to assure competition, merit review, independent scholarship, and continuous oversight by the scientific community. We conclude that the legislation introduced in January, 1989, by Senator Dodd (S.478) substantially meets these concerns and recommendations.

The Association is comfortable with the legislative response thus far provided to its concerns regarding necessary independence and adherence to the canons of merit-review. Consequently, my testimony today will leave these important concerns and will focus instead on two additional substantive issues: (1) the importance of an extensive research and development program to the success of the National Board's mission; and (2), the feasibility of completing a research project of this magnitude in the complex arena of teacher competency.

1230 SEVENTEENTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 (202) 223-9485
Facsimile (202) 775-1824

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NATIONAL BOARD'S RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards represents a logical outgrowth of the increasingly intense discussion of the teaching profession presently taking place at all levels and in all areas of the Nation. There has been remarkable consistency in the identification of a central problem of the teaching profession as the absence of recognition or reward for advanced skills of individual teachers. The National Board seeks to address this problem in part by creation of a certification system that will fairly and adequately assess advanced teacher competencies.

The apparently simple idea of assessing teacher competencies becomes remarkably complex as soon as one begins to contemplate the number of subject areas, grade levels, and disciplines to be assessed, and the number and variety of teaching situations encountered in elementary and secondary education. One thing we have learned in efforts to improve the teaching profession is that unidimensional measures of teaching competency are invariably unsatisfactory. A second thing we have learned is that accurately assessing advanced competency in teaching requires a fuller understanding of the teaching process and requires assessment procedures that are much more sophisticated than any now in use.

It should disturb the members of the Subcommittee to know that no teacher evaluation system now in use anywhere in the Nation comes close to identifying advanced teaching competencies in a reliable and valid manner.

The recent efforts of the states to improve the quality of the teaching force through increased assessment has produced some terrible examples of the deleterious effect of efforts to identify "master teachers" without adequate attention to the competency of the teaching process or without state of the art assessment procedures. In some states teachers have felt diminished by the very assessment efforts intended to elevate them. State reform efforts have too often resulted in assessing minimal expectations rather than exemplary performance, assessing the obvious rather than the subtle, and measuring those aspects of teaching that were convenient to measure rather than those of central importance.

In order to succeed in its mission, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards must create and win acceptance for an evaluation system that is without precedent in American Education. Such a system will require a research and development base not previously associated with the evaluation of teaching.

The benefits of the research and development required to perform the teacher competency assessments of the National Board may be expected to produce increased levels of understanding of teaching and of the assessment of teaching. The procedures developed will also be helpful to states which are seeking to improve assessment and will result in important new inputs to the curriculum of teacher education.

THE FEASIBILITY OF THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

I have argued above that the evaluation system required for the National Board to achieve its goals does not exist and that efforts to use existing teacher assessment procedures would prove not only inadequate to the task but detrimental to the improvement of the teaching profession. If the required system can not be borrowed or bought it must therefore be built. The question becomes, can the research and development effort be accomplished for this amount of money within the time line proposed?

I believe we can produce the teacher assessment system required to make it possible for the National Board plan to succeed. Further, I believe the money requested will be adequate, but not overly adequate, to research, develop, implement, and evaluate the system to the point that necessary subsequent refinements can be provided from operating costs.

AERA has recommended that funds be available for five years rather than three. The Association is concerned that it will take some time for top scholars to shift from present work to this important project. Unlike some fields, education does not have excess research capacity. The proposed legislation will support a five year time line for some phases of the research and this is a commendable feature.

I am optimistic that the research and development project can succeed for the following reasons:

(1) A comparative look at assessment procedures in other professions is encouraging. State of the art assessment procedures associated with professions other than education are substantially advanced and provide models which can be explored with an eye toward application to assessment of advanced teaching competencies.
(2) The field of educational measurement has developed markedly increased sophistication in recent years and can now support a teacher assessment program of this complexity.
(3) Technology, especially interactive computer technology, offers potential for situationally rich assessment procedures which could not even be contemplated a decade ago.
(4) Research about teaching and learning, much of it supported by the National Institute of Education, has provided a rich understanding of the educative process and provides an adequate basis for identification and assessment of advanced teaching competencies.

A final reason for my optimism about the feasibility and viability of the research components of the National Board project is simply intuitive. My sense is that the ingredients for a breakthrough are in place: a common understanding of the problems, high level of motivation for improvement at critical junctures in the system, an appropriate knowledge base which has been developed over the past decade or two, and one which includes the wisdom of failed efforts. What seems to be required at this point is a catalytic agent and the resources which would be provided by legislation similar to S. 478.

Attachment

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you. Representing the American Association of School Administrators is the superintendent of the Hempfield School District in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, Dr. Margaret Smith.

Dr. Smith, it is nice to see you today. Please proceed.

Dr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and panel members. As you stated, I am currently superintendent of the Hempfield Area School District in Greensburg, Pennsylvania and president-elect of the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators. I am also a member of the American Association of School Administrators, the professional organization of nearly 19,000 local school superintendents and other education executives on whose behalf I am appearing today.

AASA would like to thank you for the opportunity to put our thoughts on Federal funding for the National Teachers Certification Board on the record. When the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards was formed, AASA alone among the national professional associations in education expressed reservations about the board and its makeup.

Our reservations regarding the teacher board have subsided because the board has proceeded in a manner that demonstrates great care for the nature of teaching in the American system of education.

AASA supports Federal funding for research leading to better understanding of what good teaching is and how to identify and measure the quality of teaching. The annual survey of AASA members on topics they wish to know more about has invariably found teacher evaluation to be the topic on which information is most needed.

A count of information requests to the Education Research Service also shows that the number one or two topic each month for the last four years has been teacher evaluation. The knowledge base about what constitutes good teaching is shockingly shallow.

The lack of validated information about what good teaching is and how to measure good teaching is the principal problem in any teacher recognition scheme or performance pay plan. Since not a lot is known about best instructional practices and how to assess teacher performance, teacher education remains a hit and miss proposition.

Since the release of "A Nation At Risk" in the spring of 1983, one blue ribbon committee after another has found that we need to make large and fairly immediate gains in the quality of our elementary and secondary education system.

Nearly every report has commented on the connection between economic competitiveness and education. Clearly, in a brain-driven world economy our economic success depends on a quality education system. The key to improving education is improving teaching and the teaching environment.

Similarly, most of the reports observed that, historically, we have done an abysmal job of educating the children of the poor and minority children. However, the decline in birth rates between 1964 and 1979 has created a labor shortage, which makes every potential worker more valuable.

While birth rates were declining, the percentage of births among the poor and among blacks and Hispanics has challenged our education system to improve services to two groups which have been the recipients of the worst services. Thus, for economic and demographic reasons, we have to improve our education system at the elementary and secondary level.

Many recommendations for change in education have been posed. Many of the recommendations are posed as single solutions that, by themselves, will cure all the ills of society. Such assertions are fools gold, because they look and sound real, but, when tried alone, result in only marginal improvement.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has not claimed that the research Congress is being asked to authorize will, in the absence of other changes, bring about miraculous results.

What is clear is that without steady improvement in the quality of teaching, no progress is possible. Improving teaching requires attracting brighter young people into careers in education with high pay and good working conditions.

Rigorous undergraduate and professional education programs are the second component of improved teaching. Good teaching requires a teaching environment most conducive to success, which is the goal of the current trend toward restructured schools.

Finally, good teaching requires a long term commitment to professional development based on a knowledge of what constitutes good teaching and how to assess teaching. Given the problems posed by the lack of knowledge about teacher assessment and the high payoff for improving the knowledge base, it would be penny-wise and pound foolish for the Federal Government not to participate in the exploration of how to identify and assess teacher performance.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Dr. Smith, let me interrupt here, I hope not rudely, to tell you that those bells that have rung again mean that we only have about ten minutes before we have to leave and I would like to conclude this panel.

We have a five minute rule that we have only held the members to and not the witnesses, but if you could summarize the remainder of your testimony in a minute or so, we could give Dr. Larsen four or five minutes and conclude our hearing.

Dr. SMITH. Yes, I can do that, and, in fact, I only had just a few remarks left. We do offer our support for the legislation to provide financial assistance. We have two concerns that if the sole-source contract is authorized that peer review be incorporated and we also wish to go on the record as stating that we would be concerned if other programs about funding would be reduced such as Chapter Two in order to support this program.

Thank you for your attention.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Margaret A. Smith follows:]

STATEMENT OF

DR. MARGARET A. SMITH
SUPERINTENDENT
HEMPFIELD AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
GREENSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

ON PROPOSALS TO PROVIDE FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO
THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

GIVEN ON BEHALF OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

JULY 25, 1989

9:30 A.M.

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
THE HONORABLE PAT WILLIAMS, CHAIRMAN
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman, my name is Margaret Smith. I am Superintendent of the Hempfield Area School District in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, and President-Elect of the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators. I am also a member of the American Association of School Administrators, the professional association of nearly 19,000 local school superintendents and other education executives, on whose behalf I am appearing today.

AASA would like to thank you for the opportunity to put our thoughts on federal funding for the national teacher certification board on the record.

When the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards was formed, AASA alone among the national professional associations in education expressed reservations about the board and its makeup. Our reservations regarding the teacher board have subsided, because the board has proceeded in a manner that demonstrates great care for the nature of teaching and the American system of education.

AASA supports federal funding for research leading to better understanding of what good teaching is and how to identify and measure the quality of teaching. The annual survey of AASA members on topics they wish to know more about has invariably found teacher evaluation to be the topic on which information is most needed. A count of information requests to the Education Research Service also shows that the number one or two topic each month for the last four years has been teacher evaluation. The knowledge base about what constitutes good teaching is shockingly shallow.

The lack of validated information about what good teaching is and how to measure good teaching is the principal problem in any teacher recognition scheme or performance pay plan. Since not a lot is known about best instructional practices and how to assess teacher performance, teacher education remains a hit and miss proposition.

Since the release of A Nation At Risk in the spring of 1983, one blue ribbon committee after another has found that we need to make large and fairly immediate gains in the quality of our elementary and secondary educatiuon system. Nearly every report has commented on the connection between economic competitiveness and education. Clearly, in a brain-driven world economy our economic success depends on a quality education system. The key to improving education is improving teaching and the teaching environment.

Similarly, most of the reports observed that, historically, we have done an abysmal job of educating the children of the poor and minority children. However the decline in birth rates between 1964 and 1979 has created a labor shortage, which makes every potential worker more valuable. While birth rates were declining, the percentage of births among the poor and among blacks and Hispanics has challenged our education system to improve services to two groups which have been the recipients of the worst services. Thus, for economic and demographic reasons we have to improve our education system at the elementary and secondary level.

Many recommendations for change in education have been posed. Many of the recommendations are posed as single solutions that, by themselves, will cure all the ills of society. Such assertions are fools gold, because they look and sound real, but, when tried alone, result in only marginal improvement.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has not claimed that the research Congress is being asked to authorize will, in the absence of other changes, bring about miraculous results. What is clear is that without steady improvement in the quality of teaching, no progress is possible. Improving teaching requires attracting brighter young people into careers in education with high pay and good working conditions. Rigorous undergraduate and professional education programs are the second component of improved teaching. Good teaching requires a teaching environment most conducive to success, which is the goal of the current trend toward restructured schools. Finally, good teaching requires a long term committment to professional development based on a knowledge of what constitutes good teaching and how to assess teaching.

Given the problems posed by the lack of knowledge about teacher assessment and the high payoff for improving the knowledge base, it would be penny-wise and pound foolish for the federal government not to participate in the exploration of how to identify and assess teacher performance.

While we are offering our support for legislation to provide financial assistance to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, we are concerned, Mr. Chairman, about authorizing a large sole source contract without the protection of peer review. We assume that the normal federal peer review process will be included in research grants made by the Board. We also wish to state that we support this financial assistance, as long as existing federal education programs are not reduced in order to fund the Board. We are particularly concerned that the Chapter 2 program not be used as a source of funds. If funding would come at the expense of any existing federal education program, we would be forced to oppose funds for the National Board. Thank you.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Thank you, Dr. Smith. Dr. Larsen is president of the Nebraska Board of Education and is here representing the National Association of State Boards of Education.

Doctor, it is nice to see you today.

Dr. LARSEN. Thank you, Chairman Williams and members of the Committee. I am pleased to be here to testify on behalf of school board members all across the country.

The national board has proposed two activities. The first is the conducting of research on teaching anc how to measure teaching and the second is to establish a national assessment.

On the former, the National Association of State Boards of Education supports examination of what teachers do and how excellence can be measured and NASBE supports Federal funds for research.

States would benefit from information about how to assess entry level and advanced level of teaching. Governor Hunt alluded to the low standards that we all have for certifying teaching.

In fact, one of the reasons for that is that there is very little evidence that any of the standards we use to certify teachers have any relevance to how well they teach in the classroom.

If there are better assessment methods, they certainly will be used because our goals are the same as yours, to have the best teachers in the classroom.

I believe that measurement improves performance and if we have better measurement instruments for teaching, I think that the quality of teaching in the country will improve.

While we support the research, we do feel that entities other than the National Board should have competitive assess to the funding, as other members have mentioned. States like Connecticut are currently carrying out some programs like this and moving to implementation of a program similar to this.

We should not let those efforts go aside. Regarding the assessment by the National Board, the National Association of State Boards of Education have some concerns. The assessment shifts certification from the state level to the national level. It shifts the responsibility for certifying teachers from lay people who pay taxes to teachers.

Teaching is unlike other professions because the consumers of education do not have a choice of school nor do they have a choice of teacher in the school that they go to. They are also forced to pay for services through taxation, so the parallels between other professions is very slim.

To summarize, State Boards of Education supports Federal funding for research on teaching and the assessment of teaching. We have concerns about the actual implementation of the assessment process. We urge Congress to support the national board of providing close oversight and accountability. That is an abbreviated version.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Max Larsen follows:]

TESTIMONY

ON

THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL
TEACHING STANDARDS

BY

MAX LARSEN

FOR

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

JULY 25, 1989
10:30 A.M.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS AND DISTINGUISHED MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE. MY NAME IS MAX LARSEN. I AM A MEMBER OF THE NEBRASKA BOARD OF EDUCATION AND I AM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION (NASBE). I AM VERY PLEASED TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY BEFORE YOU THIS MORNING ON BEHALF OF STATE BOARD MEMBERS ACROSS THE COUNTRY ON THE SUBJECT OF THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS.

THE NATIONAL BOARD HAS BEEN THE SUBJECT OF CONSIDERABLE INTEREST AND DISCUSSION AMONG NASBE'S MEMBERSHIP. WE ARE PLEASED THAT THE ADVENT OF THE NATIONAL BOARD HAS CREATED AN OCCASION FOR EXAMINING SERIOUSLY WHAT EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING MEANS, AND HOW WE CAN DO A BETTER JOB IN ASSESSING AND EXPANDING THE INCIDENCE OF EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING PRACTICE. FOR ITS PARTICIPATION AND INITIATIVE IN THIS CRITICAL AREA OF EDUCATION REFORM, NASBE APPLAUDS THE NATIONAL BOARD AND STANDS READY TO ASSIST EFFORTS BY THE BOARD AND OTHER GROUPS TO IMPROVE TEACHING IN OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS.

HOWEVER, OUR MEMBERS DO NOT NECESSARILY REGARD NATIONAL CERTIFICATION AS AN ELIXIR FOR THE PROBLEMS OF TEACHING OR SCHOOLING. OUR MEMBERS HAVE QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS REGARDING THE ACTUAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BOARD'S PROPOSED ASSESSMENT AND ADVANCED CERTIFICATION PROCESS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO ENTRY-LEVEL LICENSING ACTIVITIES CURRENTLY UNDERTAKEN BY STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION. ON BEHALF OF NASBE, I WOULD LIKE TO PRESENT SOME OF THE CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY OUR MEMBERS REGARDING THE NATIONAL BOARD, AS WELL AS THE ISSUE OF FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR THE BOARD'S PROPOSED RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.

MANY OF OUR MEMBERS HAVE RAISED CONCERNS REGARDING THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL

BOARD IN ADVANCED TEACHER ASSESSMENT AND CERTIFICATION. WHAT CONCERNS MANY STATE BOARD MEMBERS IS THE PROPOSED SHIFT IN THE GOVERNANCE OF TEACHER ASSESSMENT AND CERTIFICATION FROM THE CURRENT STATE-BASED STRUCTURE, WHICH IS COMPRISED OF LAY PEOPLE, TO A SINGLE NATIONAL BOARD, COMPRISED PRIMARLY OF TEACHERS.

AS THE MEMBERS OF THIS SUBCOMMITTEE KNOW, OUR COUNTRY HAS A LONG TRADITION OF LAY AND LOCAL CONTROL OF PUBLIC EDUCATION. ACCORDINGLY, OUR MEMBERS FEEL THAT, WITH RESPECT TO AUTHORITY OVER THIS SIGNIFICANT ASPECT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION, IT IS APPROPRIATE AND IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS PROPOSED SHIFT AWAY FROM LAY CONTROL TOWARD PROFESSIONAL CONTROL, AS WELL AS THE SHIFT IN AUTHORITY FROM STATE-BASED DECISIONMAKING GROUPS TO A SINGLE NATIONAL BOARD.

WE FEEL THAT IT IS UNWISE TO ADOPT CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS UNCRITICALLY FROM OTHER PROFESSIONS THAT HAVE A DIFFERENT CHARACTER FROM PUBLIC EDUCATION. IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT, UNLIKE MEDICINE, LAW OR ACCOUNTING, OUR "CLIENTS" ARE REQUIRED TO TAKE OUR SERVICES, HAVE LITTLE CHOICE ABOUT WHERE THEY CAN GO TO GET THEM AND ARE REQUIRED TO PAY FOR THEM. BECAUSE OF THE COMPULSORY ASPECT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION AND THE FACT THAT IT IS PUBLICLY FUNDED, MANY OF OUR MEMBERS FEEL THAT THE LAY PUBLIC OUGHT TO BE REPRESENTED TO AN UNUSUAL EXTENT IN DECISIONS ABOUT THE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHERS. ALTHOUGH MANY OF OUR MEMBERS HAVE BEEN INVITED TO MEET WITH THE NATIONAL BOARD, STATE BOARD MEMBERS ARE EAGER FOR MORE SUBSTANTIVE INTERACTION WITH THE NATIONAL BOARD.

EVEN THOUGH THE NATIONAL BOARD PROPOSES A VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATION SYSTEM FOR ADVANCED TEACHERS, IF THE SYSTEM IS IMPLEMENTED AS INTENDED, IT WILL HAVE MANY IMPLICATIONS FOR DECISIONS MADE BY STATE AND LOCAL POLICYMAKERS. FOR EXAMPLE,

STATES AND LOCALITIES WILL HAVE ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF HOW TO ASSIST LESS WEALTHY SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN AFFORDING THE HIGHER SALARIES THAT WILL BE DEMANDED BY NATIONALLY CERTIFIED TEACHERS. STATE AND LOCAL LAY BOARDS WILL NEED TO REASSESS EXISTING SYSTEMS FOR EVALUATION OF PRACTICING TEACHERS. STATE AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION WILL NEED TO EXAMINE IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER PREPARATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES. PERHAPS MOST CRITICALLY, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND BOARDS WILL NEED TO REVIEW OPPORTUNITIES TO ALTER THE CURRENT STRUCTURE OF RESPONSIBILITIES, ROLES, AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR TEACHERS, TO MAKE FULL USE OF THE HIGHER LEVELS OF EXPERTISE REFLECTED IN THOSE STAFF WHO SUCCEED IN OBTAINING A NATIONAL ADVANCED CREDENTIAL. THESE ISSUES ARGUE FOR SUBSTANTIVE COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL BOARD AND STATE AND LOCAL POLICYMAKERS.

NASBE STRONGLY ENDORSES RESEARCH ACTIVITIES AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL WITH RESPECT TO EFFECTIVE TEACHING PRACTICES AND ASSESSMENT PROCESSES. THIS RESEARCH WOULD BE OF GREAT BENEFIT TO STATES, AS MANY HAVE NEITHER THE EXPERTISE NOR THE RESOURCES TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH ON THESE ISSUES THAT IS AS EXTENSIVE AND CONTINUOUS AS THAT CURRENTLY ENVISIONED UNDER THE NATIONAL BOARD. MOREOVER, RESEARCH ACTIVITY AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL WOULD HELP TO AVOID DUPLICATION OF RESEARCH EFFORTS AMONG THE STATES REGARDING TEACHER ASSESSMENT.

FURTHER, IT IS THE VIEW OF MANY OF OUR MEMBERS THAT NATIONAL RESEARCH IN THIS AREA WOULD BENEFIT STATE LICENSING AGENCIES LOOKING TO STRENGTHEN THEIR OWN ASSESSMENT PRACTICES BY PROVIDING THEM WITH A MORE SOPHISTICATED UNDERSTANDING OF HOW TO ASSESS ENTRY- AND ADVANCED-LEVEL TEACHERS. IT IS BECAUSE NATIONAL RESEARCH ON TEACHER ASSESSMENT WOULD BE BROADLY AVAILABLE TO ALL WHO ARE

RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSESSING TEACHERS AND THE TEACHING PROFESSION THAT NASBE WELCOMES NATIONAL EFFORT AND ACTIVITY IN THIS AREA.

NASBE STRONGLY ENDORSES EFFORTS AIMED AT INCREASING FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON TEACHER ASSESSMENTS. HOWEVER, IF FEDERAL FUNDING IS ALLOCATED DIRECTLY TO THE NATIONAL BOARD, WE WOULD REQUEST ASSURANCES THAT CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BY THE BOARD BE MADE ONLY AFTER OPEN COMPETITION FOR THOSE PROPOSALS WITH PEER REVIEW. SECOND, WE RECOMMEND THAT THE NATIONAL BOARD DEVELOP A PLAN FOR SHARING THE RESULTS OF THIS RESEARCH, ON AN ONGOING BASIS, WITH STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR TEACHER ASSESSMENT.

A FINAL NOTE OF CONCERN REGARDS OUR STRONGLY HELD VIEW THAT FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL BOARD'S RESEARCH INITIATIVE BE TREATED AS A SUPPLEMENT TO EXISTING COMMITMENTS FOR FEDERAL RESEARCH AND SERVICE PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION. NEW FUNDS ARE VITAL TO CARRYING OUT THESE ACTIVITIES. WE AGREE THERE IS A CLEAR ARGUMENT FOR THESE ACTIVITIES TO BE SPONSORED AND MANAGED AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL, TO ELIMINATE DUPLICATION OF EFFORT AND TO GARNER THE BENEFITS OF A NEW ASSESSMENT SYSTEM FOR TEACHERS. HOWEVER, WE URGE CONGRESS TO RECOGNIZE IT IS CONSIDERING A SUPPORT FOR A NEW FUNCTION, AND TO RESIST THE IMPULSE TO ASSIGN THIS FUNCTION TO AN EXISTING AGENCY WITHOUT NEW FUNDING OR TO TRADE OFF THIS ACTIVITY AGAINST OTHER PRIOR COMMITMENTS.

Chairman WILLIAMS. Well, thank you, Dr. Larsen. That is very helpful. Does any member of the panel wish to take a minute for questions or comments? Mr. Coleman.

Mr. COLEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, you all have mentioned the fact that the National Board is not by itself going to solve all the problems of education. I think that we and the panel got frustrated sometime this morning by trying to suggest why it doesn't and why it is not designed to do so. But it, nontheless, addresses in a very positive fashion, addressed some of the long-range needs.

So, I think we ought to recognize that as we proceed with the bill. Mr. Larsen, you mentioned that this board will have an effect, but what will be the effect on local school districts in rural areas and inner cities? You stated that salaries will have to be adjusted, that board-certified teachers will, by definition, be able to make more money and demand more money and that the state and local agencies in the various states will have to address this issue in order to attract properly certified teachers.

That is not the intent of this proposal. But these are issues that people at the state level need to address themselves.

One other word about the issue of sole-source funding. As I understand it, if you have total opening competition for funds from the Department of Education, you have to identify, in your application who your subcontractors are.

Everybody knows who is going to do what and that is it. In the process that is being proposed, the Federal Government would provide money to this group, which in turn, will have a competitive application process for certain aspects of the research. You may, in fact, have a more open competition.

So, there are two ways of looking at this issue. I thank all of you for your testimony.

Chairman WILLIAMS. I note that as we prepare, Mr. Coleman, to leave, we are going to vote on an amendment which would limit funding for SDI to one billion, $300 million dollars only.

So, this $25 million looks a little paltering in comparison, doesn't it. Well, thanks, for your counsel. We appreciate each of you being here with us.

[Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 11:50 a.m.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows.]

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

STATEMENT

OF THE

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

ON FUNDING FOR THE

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

SUBMITTED TO THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

OF THE

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

BY

MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL

NEA PRESIDENT

JULY 25, 1989

MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL, President • KEITH GEIGER, Vice President • ROXANNE E. BRADSHAW, Secretary-Treasurer
DON CAMERON, Executive Director
(202) 822-7300

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

The 1.9 million-member National Education Association represents professional and support employees in public elementary, secondary, vocational, and postsecondary schools throughout the nation. We appreciate this opportunity to comment on federal funding for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Throughout the 1980s there has been an intense interest in reevaluating the standards for professional educators — teachers, specialists, and administrators. After all the debate and discussion of the past decade, a broad consensus has emerged on at least two issues. First, achieving our nation's economic, social, and political goals depends on a dynamic, effective system of public education; and second, the quality of our nation's teaching staff is the single most important factor in determining the quality of education.

Increasingly, Americans are reaching consensus on a third issue: America's public schools must do more than adapt to changes that have occurred up to now. The schools must be transformed in order to prepare students to shape America's future, its economy, and its society.

NEA supports the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards as an important agency in the effort to improve education by ensuring that America's teaching force is comprised of creative, talented, and committed individuals with strong backgrounds in both subject matter and pedagogy. And we support federal funding for research that will help guide the

Board to establish meaningful standards and to develop instruments for assessing individuals' performance according to those standards.

Just as mass production is no longer adequate to meet America's economic needs, mass-produced education is no longer sufficient to prepare our young people for the workplace of tomorrow. It is a mistake to believe that by simply adding some "high tech" courses to the curriculum we can adequately prepare today's students for tomorrow's world. Increasingly, technological developments — and the needs of our students — will require that the teacher's primary role be to guide and facilitate multiple methods of learning and problem-solving.

It is important to note another kind of change that impacts both the workplace and the learning environment. The traditional top-down decision-making philosophy of organizational management is being rejected in favor of systems which rely on workers to be planners as well as implementers of change. We must restructure America's schools to reflect this philosophy so that our students benefit from the knowledge, skills, and creativity of the entire profession, rather than continuing to rely on the talents of a few.

The top-down model for education — patterned after the industrial model and designed to prepare young people for working within that system — is no longer relevant. If we are going to prepare for the future, we must begin to think in terms of lateral processes: involving teachers more in making the essential decisions that impact the learning process and giving

3

greater latitude to school districts and individual schools to be innovative. We must teach students to create new answers, rather than merely teaching them to recite the "right" answers.

Admittedly, there is uncertainty and risk involved in these changes. Providing teachers with greater professional autonomy requires strong assurances that teachers are qualified to use that autonomy productively and responsibly. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is an important step toward meeting that challenge.

NEA was a partner in the establishment of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, as well as in the preparation of the Carnegie Task Force's report, "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century," which proposed the creation of such a board. In 1986, some 7,500 NEA members, delegates to our Representative Assembly, passed a resolution in support of national certification. Each year since that time, NEA delegates have reiterated their support for the National Board.

We are excited at the progress so far in the development of this Board. The majority of National Board members are classroom teachers representing some of the finest individuals in our profession. This majority status of practitioners is important symbolically, but, more importantly, it guarantees that the Board's policies will be meaningful, pragmatic, rigorous, and relevant. To the extent that the teacher-members of the National Board retain their confidence in the Board's policies and operations, this certification process will reflect the

knowledge, experience, and confidence of those with the largest stake in its success.

While national certification offers hope for our efforts to strengthen the teaching profession, it is not the only improvement strategy we need. Even after the Board is fully operational, there will still be a need for states to devise credible standards for entering the teaching profession. State licensure represents a critical threshold for those aspiring to the title of "teacher." Yet licensure standards and processes leave much to be desired, and worse, our collective inability to uphold existing standards have made a mockery of state licensure — the process and the requirements.

To meet these challenges, the NEA has developed a comprehensive integrated model for advancing the professionalization of teaching. In conjunction with our state and local affiliates, we are promoting a system of professional certification by the National Board, advocating professional standards boards at the state level that will inspire confidence in entry-level standards, and we are seeking new, creative ways for teachers to participate in instructional and school decisions of all types.

The first stage in these processes calls for consensus on what knowledge, skills, and talents are required to be a good teacher, and then to develop tools for assessing these qualifications. This process has already begun. The educational research community has responded with several projects which show promise. The work of Lee Shulman at Stanford University, as well

as projects by the Educational Testing Service and the RAND Corporation Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession, inspire great hope that rigorous standards for entry to teaching practice can be translated into meaningful, valid, and rigorous assessment procedures. The objective of these efforts is not to prescribe a single model of pedagogy, but to establish high standards for entry and for professional practice, using reputable mechanisms for measuring candidates professional capabilities. NEA sees the National Board as a catalyst for meaningful improvements in teacher assessment practices.

As well, NEA sees the independence of the National Board as an essential ingredient for its success and its integrity. The Board must remain free from pressure to compromise its standards, take shortcuts, or make exceptions. The credibility and effectiveness of the Board — and of individuals certified by the Board — depends on the Board's ability to function free of legislative fiat or political winds. The Board should not be a branch of government, nor should it be perceived as such. The assessments used for certification must be empirical, not political. NEA is convinced that the Board's record thus far attests to its ability to reach consensus from among its diverse and dynamic membership — all in the interest of setting professional standards and assessment techniques that are worthy of the profession and of the public's trust.

In order to retain full autonomy over its policies and practices, the Board has proposed that support for the Board's activities should come from foundations, individuals interested

in improving the teaching profession, and ultimately the fees of those seeking certification. However, at this stage of development, the Board is still some years away from granting its first certificate. The NEA has come to believe that for this endeavor to succeed, some federal assistance is necessary and appropriate. Not only would such federal assistance provide the needed resources to fund research to develop empirical assessments of what makes a good teacher, but it would also send a signal to other potential financial contributors that the work of the Board — defining high standards for the teaching profession — is truly in the national interest.

Given that autonomy is an essential element of the Board, federal assistance for this initial research function of the Board must be free of encumbrances or preconceptions about what the results of that research would be. The results of Board-supported research should reflect the conclusions of educational researchers, not of Congress, the U.S. Department of Education, or any other entity subject to political forces. Any congressional appropriations provided for research related to activities of the Board should be free of any damaging, constraining, or nongermane amendments.

Further, federal funds allocated to the Board by the Congress must not come from any existing federally supported education program, nor should it preempt funding from other education programs deserving of support. Finally, the federal government's role must be to encourage and support funding from

other sources, not to serve as the primary and continuing contributor to the Board.

In conclusion, let it be understood that no one cares more about a quality public educational system than do the men and women currently working in the public schools. Throughout its history, NEA has been committed to improving student learning, elevating the status of the teaching profession, and promoting the cause of public education. We believe that the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards can make a significant contribution to these goals, and we look forward to working with you to achieve true excellence and equity in education.

Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF ALBERT SHANKER, PRESIDENT
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, AFL-CIO
ON FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR THE
NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS
BEFORE THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION & LABOR
July 25, 1989

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

The American Federation of Teachers strongly endorses legislation to provide research support for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. This Board has requested federal assistance in order to pay for research that will help to develop standards and to determine what skills are needed to be a superior teacher. The tests that are now in existence are not useful in the process of determining the qualifications that teachers need to meet.

Currently, teacher tests are purely instrumental--they sort and screen and set cut-off scores for minimum competency. Test questions are eliminated if too many of the sample test-takers failed and, while efforts are made to establish job-relatedness, existing tests often have no relationship to skills needed in the classroom. This sort of testing, which dominates the teaching profession, really has little or nothing to do with determining the necessary skills needed to support and enhance professional practices. Fortunately, this type of testing need not be the norm any longer.

The type of testing that regulates other professions is largely unknown in education. Tests, in most every profession, seek to examine the

professional knowledge base of the individual taking the test. These type of tests also screen and
have cut-off scores, but they seek to test what is worth knowing in order to be a competent professional.

The successful lawyer, architect or doctor must pass such a test before being certified to practice. Passing scores for these exams do not fluctuate with job markets or pass/fail rates. This is the type of testing that is common in other professions and is greatly needed in education.

The purpose of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is to develop testing instruments for the teaching profession similar to those already in use by other professions. If this effort is successful, we believe the following things will happen: teacher training institutions will modify their curriculum to meet the new standards in the profession, and more qualified people will aspire to meet the higher standards expected from teachers.

The availability of such tests may drive efforts for increased compensation, and as new standards are approved and met, student achievement will be positively affected. It is important to note also that some things will not happen: teacher licensing will not become subject to the National Board, and state and local officials will continue to hold licensing power and, in all likelihood, will continue to make licensing decisions based upon market factors and financial realities. Not every teacher will be able to meet the new standards, and with school reorganization, it will not be nec-

essary for every teacher to be board-certified.

The current situation in teacher testing **must be changed** if our schools are to meet the challenges of the 21st century. The only way that teacher testing will change for the better is if this Board succeeds. Change in this area must come from an outside agency that has massive popular support and has built a consensus in the education community.

I believe the Board's mission does have support from the public. As this hearing indicates, the Board has built an impressive consensus for its work in the education community.

The funds that have been requested are critical for the success of this enterprise. If federal support is not forthcoming, we may see this promising movement languish for several years missing the wave of public support that currently exists. If this movement for education quality does not succeed, the public will be poorer for the Congress' failure to invest the $25 million needed for its success.

The AFT urges that any federal support provided should be earmarked for research alone. We also urge that all research become public property in order to help all who are concerned with improving the teaching force. Normal federal requirements for auditing and assurances, that funds are matched and spent for the proper purposes, are a must in this legislation.

Beyond these requirements, however, we believe that the Board should be left to pursue its mission. Federal support has been made avail-

able for projects that serve the national interest with a minimum of strings--I cannot think of another project that would better serve the national interest than one that will stimulate the improvement of the teaching profession.

A final reason for the Congress to act now is the tremendous leverage that a relatively small investment will now have on our educational future. Investing twenty-five million dollars now can pay huge dividends in employability, competitiveness and productivity of our workforce and economy. These dollars could be the most crucial education support that the Congress votes in this decade. I urge swift positive action on this important matter.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this matter and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

opeiu#2/aflcio

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

STATEMENT

OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

ON FUNDING FOR THE

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

SUBMITTED TO THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARD EDUCATION

OF THE

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 4, 1989

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) submits the following statement, for the record, on proposed legislation to provide a sole source award of $25 Million to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

AACTE has a long history of support for open competition for federal research funds and peer review to allocate those funds. We believe this process represents a core value to the research community and is central to assuring its integrity. For that reason we have opposed efforts to earmark federal monies for particular organizations or institutions and have spoken against members of our own Association when they have attempted such practices. Given the importance of the principles of peer review and open competition we must speak against proposed legislation to give an earmark or sole source award to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Our quarrel is not with the Board, but rather with the mechanism it seeks to sustain its activities. We agree that more research is needed on teacher effectiveness and how it is measured. However, we are at a loss to understand why the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is more qualified to manage the conduct of this research than the Office for Educational Research and Improvement. OERI has a long history of supporting educational research and disseminating its findings, and a professional staff capable of managing a complex research enterprise.

We have heard that some within the education community take exception to procedures and decisions undertaken by previous administrations in regard to educational research. When the public has concern about the workings of government, our system of checks and balances provides an opportunity to address these concerns. Several years ago, for example, when Mr. Williams was chairman on the Subcommittee on Select Education, the Congress undertook an extensive review of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to the successful end of strengthening the peer review system. If there are persons or groups who feel this agency within the Department of Education continues to need restructuring or revision, they should work to improve it rather than seek to establish an alternative.

We are unequivocal in our opposition to an earmark such as that represented in the proposal to fund the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. In addition we are troubled by the "research agenda" put forward by spokespersons for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. They suggest that the research and development supported by Federal monies will include criteria for selection of examiners, training programs for the examiners, determining how many assessment centers the Board will need, building information management systems to handle applicant data, and finding efficient ways to communicate with teachers about the Board's standards and assessment requirements. These are administrative and training, not research issues.

We urge the Congress to demonstrate its commitment to teachers and teaching by increased support for the Office for Educational Research and Improvement and through enactment of scholarship and loan programs to recruit persons into the profession.

CONTACT: Penelope M. Earley, Director
Policy Development, Public and Governmental Relations
AACTE
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036

(202) 293-2450